Horace's Iambic Criticism

CASTING BLAME
(*IAMBIKĒ POIĒSIS*)

TIMOTHY S. JOHNSON

MNEMOSYNE SUPPLEMENTS MONOGRAPHS ON GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

BRILL

Horace's Iambic Criticism

Mnemosyne

Supplements

Monographs on Greek and Latin Language and Literature

Editorial Board

G.J. Boter
A. Chaniotis
K.M. Coleman
I.J.F. de Jong
T. Reinhardt

VOLUME 334

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.nl/mns

Horace's Iambic Criticism

Casting Blame (*Iambikē Poiēsis*)

By

Timothy S. Johnson

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2012

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Johnson, Timothy S.
Horace's iambic criticism : casting blame (iambike poiesis) / by Timothy S. Johnson.
p. cm. – (Mnemosyne. Supplements, ISSN 0169-8958 ; v. 334)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-90-04-21523-8 (hardcover : alk. paper)
1. Horace–Criticism and interpretation. 2. Iambic pentameter. I. Title.

PA6411.J56 2012
871'.01–dc23

2011036934

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 978 90 04 21523 8

Copyright 2012 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Global Oriental, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

For Pam
(meorum finis amorum)

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements IX
Abbreviations XI

A Personal Introduction 1
Civil War and "I" 1
Horace's Iambic Drama 6
Singing with Canidia 8
Iambikē Poiēsis: Action and Continuity 17
Life, Times, and Literature 21
Raising Questions 29

Chapter 1. *Non Res Et Agentia Verba Lycamben*: On Not Hunting Down Lykambes 35
Disavowing Iambic: The Negative and Positive 36
Archilochus and the Lykambid Tradition 44
Horace on Archilochus: The Limits of Mockery 56
Another Side to Iambic 64

Chapter 2. Society, Iambic Rage, and Self-Destruction (Epodes 1–7) 77
Complicating Loyalties (Epodes 1–4) 77
Lykambid Infection (Epodes 5–6) 100
Lykambid Rome (Epode 7) 109
Γνῶθι Σαυτόν 115

Chapter 3. Rage—Repression—Rage: Iambic Responsions (Epodes 8–15) 121
Keeping Vendetta Down? (Epode 8) 122
Sympotic Anxiety (Epode 9) 133
Cursing Maevius (Epode 10) 136
Elegy, Iambic-Style (Epodes 11 and 15) 138
Mixing-Up Iambic Expectations (Epode 12) 144
Late Delivery: Maecenas and His Love-Sick Poet (Epodes 13–14) 146

Chapter 4. Horace's Lying Lyre (Epodes 16–17) 153
Sailing Away: Iambic Hopes (Epode 16) 153
Horace's Duet with Canidia (Epode 17) 163

Chapter 5. Horace's Iambic to Lyric Re/cantation (*C.* I.1; 5; 13–17) 181
Overture to Re/cantation: Acts of Resolution (*C.* I.1.5; 13–15) .. 183
Lyric Attraction (*C.* I.1) 183
From Outrage to Blessing (*C.* I.5; 13–15) 191
Re/cantation (*C.* I.16; 17) 209
Inviting Consonance (*C.* I.16) 209
P.S. Tyndaris (*C.* I.17) 226
Summation 229

Chapter 6. Critical Pluralities: *Iambikē Poiēsis* in the Start and Stop of the *Ars Poetica* 231
The Critical "Older Horace" 231
The Bad Painter and Mad Poet: Artistic and Social Fragmentation 235
At the Middle of Horace's *Ars* 259
The Value of Criticism: Artistic and Social Cohesion 265
Quintilius: The Necessity of Constructive Criticism (*Ars Poetica* 419–452) 265
The Death of Vergil's Quintilius: Criticism As Comfort (*C.* I.24) 267

An Iambic Post-Lude 275

Works Cited 277
Subject Index 299
Index Nominum 309

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My iambic criticism is not a solo. Laurel Fulkerson, Stephen Harrison, and Lewis Sussman took on the first draft and made insightful criticisms. Jim Marks read two drafts of the Personal Introduction and improved both, and Arne Johnson, my youngest brother and a talented structural engineer, corrected me about the construction of the courthouse in Paris (An Iambic Post-Lude). Gonda Van Steen insisted the structure be improved, and she was right. Doug Olson told me I was assuming too much, and he was right. From the start, Kirk Freudenburg advised that we all needed to take a fresh look at Horace's *Ars Poetica*, and he was right. When late in the game I lost my way in the theory, Allen Miller cleared my head by challenging me to interact with the literature on ritual reciprocity and the scapegoat. His chapter, "Epos and Iambos Or Archilochus Meets the Wolfman" in *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness* (London 1994), is essential reading. Also, my brother Galen, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Rhode Island and General Secretary of the International Merleau-Ponty Circle, introduced me to the writings of Jean-Luc Nancy and recommended his work on listening, while we walked Daytona Beach. Our back-and-forth e-mail conversations on aesthetics and phenomenology are interwoven throughout the Introduction. Galen is the most gifted listener I am privileged to know. His most recent book, *Retrieval of the Beautiful* (Evanston, IL 2010), is only one example.

Many helped me see beyond my faults and I am grateful: friends Mark and Fletcher Bowden, Russell Clifton, Dawn and Kevin Conti, John Fairless, Colleen Harrell, Al Latini, and Pat Stump; colleagues Randall Childree, Jim McKeown, Miller Krause, and Robert Wagman; brothers Dwayne and Mark; my beautiful daughter Katie; my wife Pam, who makes me whole wherever we are. Here's to you Gareth Schmeling and Silvia Montiglio, and the first time we will drink together in Charleston. You both are always deep in my heart. Gareth, I tried to "show up at the door with some fur on."

Although she enjoys her place and is in a strange way needed, singing with one's own Canidia involves some pain and requires at times contrived surrenders, as Horace plays it (*iam, iam efficaci do manus scientiae*, epode 17.1). I am indebted to my colleagues at the College of Charleston for their confidence and for completing my journey to the South: Kristen

Gentile, Jim Newhard, Darryl Phillips, Noelle Zeiner-Carmichael, Joann Gulizio, Kevin Pluta, Mark Del Mastro—and David Cohen, the Dean of the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs, whose support helps make Charleston a great place for Classics.

ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW	Temporini, H., and Haase, W., edd. *Aufsteig und Neidergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* (Berlin, 1972–).
A.P.	*Anthologia Palatina*
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
D.	Diehl, E., ed. *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* (Leipzig, 1925–1927).
FGrH	Jacoby, F., ed. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Berlin, 1923–1958).
FHG	Müller, C., ed. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. 5 vols. (Paris, 1841–1870).
G.-P.	Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L., edd. *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*. 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1968).
HE	Gow, A.S.F., and Page, D.L., edd. *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1965).
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae* (Berlin, 1873–1914)
K.-H.	Kiessling, A., ed. *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Berlin, 1884); *Oden und Epoden*. vol. 1, 9th ed. rev. Heinze (1958); *Satiren*. vol. 2, 6th ed. (1957); *Briefe*. vol. 3, 5th ed. (1957).
L.-P.	Lobel, E., and Page, D.L., edd. *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Oxford, 1955).
LSJ	Liddell, H.G.; Scott, R.; and Jones, H.S., edd. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. (Oxford, 1940).
N.-H.	Nisbet, R.G.M., and Hubbard, M. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I* (Oxford, 1970); *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II* (Oxford, 1978).
OCD	Hammond, N.G.L., and Scullard, H.H., edd. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1970); Hornblower, S., and Spawforth, A., edd. 3rd ed. (1996).
OLD	Glare, P.G.W., *et al.*, edd. *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1968–1982).
PCG	Kassel, R. and Austin, C. edd. *Poetae Comici Graeci* (Berlin, 1983–)
Pf.	Pfeiffer, R., ed. *Callimachus*. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1949; 1953).
PIR	Klebs, E.; Dessau, H.; and Rohden, P. von, edd. *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I. II. III* (Berlin, 1897–1898).
PLG	Bergk, T., ed. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1843).
PMG	Page, D.L., ed. *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford, 1962).
S.B.	Shackleton Bailey, D.R., ed. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Stuttgart, 1985). 3rd ed. (Leipzig, 2001).
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (Amsterdam, 1923–).

W. West, M.L., ed. *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*. 2 vols. (Oxford, 1971; 1972); 2nd ed. (1989; 1992).

Journals are abbreviated according to the conventions of *L'Année Philologique*. Abbreviations of the ancient authors derive from the *OCD*, *OLD*, and *LSJ*.

A PERSONAL INTRODUCTION

> ἐν οἷς κατὰ τὸ ἁρμόττον καὶ τὸ ἰαμβεῖον ἦλθε μέτρον—διὸ καὶ ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ τούτῳ ἰάμβιζον ἀλλήλους.
> (Arist. *Po.* 1448b30–32)
>
> In these poems iambic was used as the appropriate meter, and for this reason it is now called iambic, because it was in this meter that they were accustomed to ridicule one another.

> irasci celerem, tamen ut placabilis essem.
> (Hor. *Epist.* I.20.25)
>
> I am quick-tempered, but so as to be easily appeased.

Civil War and "I"

Like Horace and Ovid I am nearly fifty years old (*circa lustra decem*, *C.* IV.1.6a; *lustris bis iam mihi quinque peractis*, Ov. *Ibis* 1b). I lived over half of my forty-nine years in the plains of central Illinois, my first twenty in Paris (which sounds cosmopolitan but is not). Paris, a small community among large farms, serves as the seat for Edgar County, and, like many rural towns in the middle of their county, the middle of Paris is anchored by a dominating historic courthouse, in this case a Romanesque-styled wonder with the statue of *Lady Justice* fixed triumphantly on top, facing west, poised between earth and sky. When the trial lawyer Abraham Lincoln traveled the eighth judicial circuit in Illinois, he worked inside that courthouse. I was raised in the "Land of Lincoln." Two pictures hung in the fifth grade classroom where I first learned *my* American history: portraits of Presidents Washington and Lincoln. I knew the Civil War: the Southerners, to save their elitist way of life and livelihood, made war, and President Lincoln by his own wit and life-blood preserved *our* Union. The conflict could be summed up in the extremes of self-sacrifice for the whole versus violence to benefit the few—too easy.

I grew up.[1] Classics and my teaching career took me south. I spent a year at Truman State University in Missouri, a "border state." The next year I joined the Classics faculty at Baylor University, and Waco, Texas, a very different place than Illinois, became my home for the next five years. One more move brought me through the heart of the South to Gainesville and the University of Florida. A friend in Gainesville calls me a "Yankee." I took the name-calling (invective, I might call it) to be nothing more than comical fun until he went with my wife and me for our first visit to Fort Sumter at Charleston, South Carolina, where the first shots were fired in the "War Between the States." He said that although he had been to the Fort a number of times, he felt strange standing there with a friend from the North. In the "War of Northern Aggression" the Union, Lincoln and his general William Tecumseh Sherman, burned down my friend's cities and homes, a devastation now etched onto historical markers throughout the South.

I have now seen some of the two perspectives, North and South, and yet when I sat four summers ago (June 2005) in Ford's Theater and looked up at the presidential box where Lincoln was shot, I could not look past my Northern point of view.[2] I have learned for myself that in civil conflict winners and losers endure in many respects a common suffering that ironically has the potential to keep them divided, and the memory of this pain lasts the generations, not just a few years. It is burned deep into the landscape: Edgar County's Courthouse, Lincoln's tomb, and the surviving defiant mansions of Macon, Georgia.[3]

---

[1] Cf. Henderson (1987; 1999: 93) on Vergil and Horace: "... these little boys *do* grow up"—Vergil from the *Eclogues* to the *Aeneid*; Horace from the *Satires* to *Epistles* and from the *Epodes* to *Odes*.

[2] Right now—and long after I first thought through my 'civil war travelogue'—my house is in boxes ready for a move to Charleston, South Carolina, where I will have the privilege of joining the faculty of Classics at the College of Charleston. The fates are twisted, but in this case in a very kind way.

[3] Civic memory often depends on a common forgetting (Detienne, 1967), which "blame-making" (one strand of the iambic tradition) would seem to disallow. When blame and guilt, however, are universalized to all levels of Roman society and presented as symptoms of being Roman ("fates drive on the Romans ever since Romulus slew his brother Remus," epode 7), then they have the potential to force a type of collective remembering. Horace does exactly that in the course of his *Epodes*, portraying his society in conflict from the lowest to highest, and he does not exclude either the iambist or the external audience. Vergil, on the other hand, manufactures civic memory out of nostalgia. He projects the cityscape of Rome back onto the landscape of Evander's Palatine Hill so that the Romans can imagine their connection to a common distant past (note a thesis in progress by Emmanuelle Raymond, University of Lyon: "*Musa Mihi Memora* ... Recherche sur les aspects de le mémoire dans l' Enéide").

When we know from the experience of our own countries and peoples that political impasse and civil disruption heal slowly, we should not expect Roman literature, written during transitions from the republic to principate and then imperial rule, to move quickly or smoothly from war to peace, from angry protest to calm acceptance. Propertius remembered how his homeland was decimated, when it fell to Octavian in the Perusine War (40 BC), and he punctuated his *monobiblos*, published over ten years later (about 28 BC), with the pain of that civil conflict:

> Qualis et unde genus, qui sunt mihi, Tulle, Penates,
> quaeris pro nostra semper amicitia.
> si Perusina tibi patriae sunt nota sepulcra,
> Italiae duris funera temporibus,
> cum Romana suos egit discordia cives—
> sic mihi praecipue, pulvis Etrusca, dolor,
> tu proiecta mei perpessa's membra propinqui,
> tu nullo miseri contegis ossa solo—
> proxima suppositos contingens Umbria campos
> me genuit terris fertilis uberibus. (Prop. 1.22)

> By the name of our unending friendship, Tullus, you ask from what high ancestry I have come and which Penates are mine. If you know of our fatherland's Perusine graves, death in Italy's dire days when Rome's civil strife pursued her own citizens,—Etruscan dust, you are the chief cause of my grief; you suffered the bodies of my family to lie exposed; you did not cover their bones with even a speck of dirt—neighboring Umbria, bordering the plain below her, rich in her fertile lands, gave me birth.

Horace, in his *Odes* (published in 23 BC, eight years after Octavian won at Actium and six years after he celebrated the victory as part of a triple triumph), did not anticipate anyone forgetting the hurt and guilt any time soon:

> audiet civis acuisse ferrum
> quo graves Persae melius perirent,
> audiet pugnas vitio parentum
> rara iuventus. (C. I.2.21–24)

> Youths will hear that citizens against citizens sharpened the blade,
> which should have been used to slay the troublesome Parthians;
> our youths, made sparse by their parents' crime,
> will hear of the battles their parents wrought for themselves.

Although these two poets and the others we name "Augustan" participated in Rome's social and political conflicts in different ways and operated out of varied poetic modes, they all watched or remembered their fellow-citizens suffering at one another's hands. It stands to reason that

they would be concerned both with giving voice through their poetry to the anger and pain of their people, and with correcting fault-lines that might lead to another deadly disruption.

It would be a vital but difficult undertaking to temper through speech or poetics rage and resentment, natural consequences of deeply set civil divisions. Discourse, conditioned by the intense factionalism of civil war, would be marked by the impulse to use invective (blame-speech) in order to dominate one's opponent. President Lincoln, for example, called on the people to pray their way past the anger of civil war, but labeled that war, "a needless and cruel rebellion:"

> Now, therefore, be it known, that I do set apart Thursday, the sixth day of August next, to be observed as a day for National Thanksgiving, praise, and prayer; and I invite the people of the United States to … invoke the influence of His Holy Spirit, to subdue the anger which has produced, and so long sustained a needless and cruel rebellion, to change the hearts of the insurgents … (Abraham Lincoln, Proclamation July 15, 1863)

His invitation to thanksgiving, praise, and prayer insists on his particular brand of national identity ("the people of the United States;" "insurgents") and retains a militaristic spirit. The "anger" must be "subdued," if not willingly then presumably by force.[4] Horace in similar circumstances, while Rome is reeling and then recovering from civil war (mid 30s–early 20s BC), introduces her to Greek iambic (… *Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio*, *Epist.* I.19.23–24a), a poetry first composed by Archilochus and known for its abusive invective. Honored for his metrics, Archilochus was notorious for so maligning the daughters of Lykambes that they hung themselves rather than live on shamed. Horace alleges, however, that he fashioned for Rome a Parian iambic that conveyed Archilochean spirit but was outside the Lykambid tradition

[4] Cf. Girard's reference (1972: 2) to Storr's *Human Aggression* (1968: 11–19): "It is more difficult to quell an impulse toward violence than to rouse it." Lincoln is like Horace in this respect: Horace does not define emotions, such as anger, nor confine them to the individual. He takes for granted that every human understands what anger is and how to express it (*C.* I.16.13–16). This may be a dangerous assumption (Solomon, 1984: 241–253; Rosaldo, 1984: 142–145), but it is commonly made. Defining anger in classical antiquity is for the most part the business of philosophers and medical writers. See Konstan on the emotions (2003: 99–120; 2006: 41–76) with special attention to Aristotle; also Braund and Most (2004). Konstan points out that Aristotle's definition of anger depends on a hierarchical system of status, because anger arises when a person feels slighted, and the slight for some reason (differences in status, wealth, power) cannot be corrected (*Rh.* 1378a31–33). "The *orgê* of the Greeks, like anger today, was conditioned by the social world in which it operated" (Konstan, 2006: 76; see also Barbalet, 1998). Anger, therefore, occurs on a personal and social level, which is the case in Horace's *Epodes*.

(*numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben*, 19.24b–25). We have yet to answer regarding the iambic Horace, "How could he do this without forfeiting the genre's vitality and denying its usefulness for establishing a common moral code?" The question is part of a larger concern over how or whether Horatian praxis determines a positive value for iambic, which his strong defense for his iambic achievement appears to claim.

Any time a group is under duress so that it splinters, and factions "go to war" with weapons or words, the context in which Horace's iambic operates, one possible scenario is for the stronger to dominate and repress the weaker until effectively silenced or annihilated. History has witnessed attempts, some horrific in their tragic extremes (world war, genocide, armed brutality), others more palatable for a time (oppression of particular rights). Answers, however, working to reformulate some consensus among a fragmented people without such deadly suppression, would involve a complex and multivalent civic discourse, which not only recognizes differences but promotes cohesion through some negotiated sense of belonging (*societas*).[5] If Horace, while claiming to be Archilochean, means to identify his iambic criticisms with the latter category,[6] then he will have to challenge expectations for the genre without making it any less dynamic.[7] This will not be a simple task. He is handling genres (satire and iambic) known for being judgmental not sociable. Claiming to follow an Archilochean spirit (... *animosque secutus /Archilochi*, 19.24–25a) while not including spite is counterintuitive, and, when Horace introduces characters who question his iambic prowess, he does not allow his readers to ignore the matter. Further, as Demosthenes cautioned his jury, people by nature become caught up in hearing such abuse (ὃ φύσει πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ὑπάρχει, τῶν μὲν λοιδοριῶν καὶ τῶν κατηγοριῶν ἀκούειν ἡδέως, *Orat.* 18.3.7–8).[8] Scandal can be fun as long as we are on the right

---

[5] See, for example, the conversations in Foucault's (1977: 199–233) "Practice: Knowledge and Power;" n.b. "Revolutionary Action: 'Until Now.'"

[6] The plural "criticisms" indicates that *Iambic Criticism* means both the criticism Horace delivers through his iambic and his criticism/discussion of iambic. The same operating principles are evident in both.

[7] E.g., Conte (1994: 297): "All this has contributed to create an impression of literary artificiality, and it has even been said that sometimes the *res* do come from Archilochus, without Horace's being able to recreate the *animi*."

[8] Freudenburg (2005: 24–25) comments in his introduction to satire: "But there are even bigger challenges that this genre tosses in the way of its own companionability. Perhaps most notable of these is its strong penchant for passing judgment in fuming, hyperbolic tones—with raw sexual desire as its gutter-mate—anger ranks as the least

side or at a safe distance, which concern implies that there is more at stake than entertainment. Mockery can be used to define who or what is acceptable and who or what is not. If shaming, therefore, aimed at those, voluntarily or involuntarily, marked as "cast-aways" (κάθαρμα) can provide a cathartic effect for a group by reinforcing its standards,[9] then what is to prevent iambic with its invective from being reduced to an antagonistic mechanism for forced compliance, at times amusing but in effect deadly, at least for some (*Epist.* II.1.145–155; *Ars* 281–284)?

Horace's Iambic Drama

When Horace looks back and comments on the nature of his *Epodes* (*Epist.* I.19.21–34), he rejects the reception of Archilochus that limits iambic to a mode for assault, designed to inflict suffering (Chapter 1, *Non Res Et Agentia Verba Lycamben*: On Not Hunting Down Lykambes). To push beyond this boundary, he combines iambic strains, the drive for vengeance and purification with the concept of exchange (shared experience) in reciprocal song.[10] Through an impressive variety of episodes, Horace's *Epodes* presents a unified drama in which the iambist first acknowledges that he and his people are perpetuating a cycle of blame, shame, and vengeance. This "Lykambid mentality" gains momentum until it infects all the Roman people and leaves them fighting against themselves (Chapter 2, Society, Iambic Rage, and Self-Destruction, Epodes 1–7),[11] but then Horace sets his iambic apart

sociable of human emotions; and it is precisely this emotion that is most commonly associated with satire." Likewise, the Greeks tended to regard "mockery" (καταγελᾶν), without the controls of a ritual or comic context, as an aggressive act (Halliwell, 2008: 25–38). Nonetheless, right now I can find nothing to watch on television but the scandal surrounding Michael Jackson's death, interrupted now and then by the infidelities of South Carolina's governor. Our curiosity about those shamed and their accusers knows no limit.

[9] Here I refer to the "scapegoat" (φαρμακός) ritual complex, first attested in Hipponax (5–12, 37, 41, 92, 95, 104, 118, 128, 152–153 W); see *infra*. Bremmer stresses (1983: 300–301) the hyperbolic nature of Hipponax's accounts.

[10] Compare from Euripides' *Bacchae* Pentheus' violent mockery of Dionysus (and Dionysus' retaliatory ridicule, 854–856; n.b. that the chorus calls on Dionysus to throw a noose around Pentheus' neck, 1020–1023) with the inclusivity of Dionysiac revelry (Halliwell, 2008: 136–137). Ritual laughter often included stylized reciprocal insults; see further discussion in Chapter 1.

[11] Cf. the tragic/destructive personification of *Iambos* standing on the crumbling walls of sacked Troy (*Iliou Persis* fr. 7.1 Bernabé, 1996: {ὁ} Ἴαμβος / ἐξ ὀλίγου διαβὰς προφόρωι ποδί, ὄθι γυῖα / τεινόμενα ῥώοιτο, καὶ εὐσθενὲς ἦδος ἔχηισι).

from this singular mindset. As he moves through his iambics to lyrics (*Epodes* to *Odes*), he stages acts of aggression and retaliation along with attempts at resistance and reconciliation so that this shifting back and forth within and between the songs creates a correspondence between various singers and perspectives. For example, he writes three stereotypical attacks (epodes 8, 10, 12) and places them in rotation with contrasting motifs (sympotic celebration and the lover's lament, epodes 9, 11, 13, 14). The rapid back and forth illustrates that the *Epodes* play between the desire for retribution / purification and the pain of un/deserved loss: aggression and attempted repression (Chapter 3, Rage—Repression—Rage: Iambic Responsions, Epodes 8–15).[12] Unity, therefore, begins to develop out of diversity, the *polyeideia* within the iambic tradition. When the *Epodes* draws to a close, the lyre takes up the struggle. Horace's lyre engages Canidia, the personification of iambic pain (Chapter 4, Horace's Lying Lyre, Epodes 16–17). She recognizes the threat that Horace's corresponding *carmina* (responsion) holds for her iambic view (one-sided vengeance) with words that anticipate Horace's later disavowal of iambic's tragic potency: *"plorem artis in te* ***nil agentis*** *exitus?"* ("Should I cry over the results of my skill, accomplishing nothing at all against you?"; cf. *non res et* ***agentia*** *verba Lycamben*, *Epist.* I.19.25). The lyre continues the responsion until the destructive tendencies within the *Epodes* are systematically resolved into an invitation to join Horace in his song (Chapter 5, Horace's Iambic to Lyric Re/cantation, *C.* I. 1; 5; 13–17). The iambic-lyric Horace in essence finds a way to construct a complex iambic ethos and thereby resist a destructive cycle of retaliatory vengeance. This is the point at which Horace socializes his iambic and literary criticism. The acts of transgression, responsion, and the resulting formation of a diversified unity, become the *telos* of Horatian poetics (Chapter 6, Critical Pluralities: *Iambikē Poiēsis* in the Start and Stop of the *Ars Poetica*).[13] Throughout his career, then, Horace "Casts Blame," putting it on display

---

[12] Such ambivalence is part of the Greek culture of abuse. See Halliwell (2008: 28, 78) on the end of the *Odyssey* ("Awareness of a powerful drive to abuse one's dead enemies coexists throughout Greek culture with an ethical imperative to restrain that drive. But the balance between urge and restraint varies greatly with the social, ethical and psychological parameters of each situation.") and on the thematic variations shared by the songs in *Od.* 8, which center around the divine laughter at the lovers Ares and Aphrodite when they are caught in Hephaestus' trap.

[13] Lowrie (2009b: 103–111) poses a similar question, when she asks whether Horace's iambic/lyric has an efficacy. She sees in Horace a "profound ambivalence about poetry's actual role in society" (103). I would argue that this ambivalence could in fact be itself effective, since it results from the act of creating the responsions among various

to be judged and enjoyed by his audience, and in doing so he continues the traditions of iambic and its mockery, which were theatrical, included in such communal ceremonies as festive performances, processions, and pageants.[14]

Singing with Canidia

Here I want to be specific about definitions, process, and outcome. Horace begins by admitting invective and its rage into his iambic, while he makes them part of a larger iambic-lyric program featuring transgression, responsion, and fusion.[15] By emulating what is also a ritualistic

---

perspectives necessary for a multiplex societal discourse. As Lowrie astutely observes, "In the *Epodes*, Horace is less interested in the absolute success or failure of various discourses than their interrelation."

[14] Iambic invective and ritual laughter were dramatic enterprises. After "mapping out" the various ritual contexts, Halliwell concludes (2008: 194): "One thing which stands out here is a strong tendency towards the dynamics of quasi-theatrical performance, i.e. the provision of a 'staged' spectacle for an audience (sometimes literally a theatre audience);" Barchiesi (2009b: 329): "In the *Epodes*, the 'iambic' code apparently encourages situations which are almost dramatic, because the utterance takes into account reactions and changes on the part of the audience."

[15] Thanks to Professor Gregory Nagy for suggesting the word "fusion" as the appropriate general outcome for ritual; cf. Burkert, 1972: 93: "Characteristically, these antitheses do not collapse into a uniform duality. They are, rather, generally transformed, each into the other, like night into day . . ."; compare Foucault and Foucault on Blanchot: "Preface to Transgression," 1977: ". . . transgression forces the limit to face the fact of its imminent disappearance, to find itself in what it excludes . . .", 34–35; on philosophy and praxis, Foucault (2001: 1–41, 355–370), as well as Hadot's "intellectual and spiritual communities" and the expansion of self ["dilation"], 1995: 59; 172–236; also Derrida's explication of the ambivalent *pharmakon* ("If the *pharmakon* is "ambivalent," it is because it constitutes the medium in which opposites are opposed, the movement and play that links them among themselves, reverses them or makes one side cross over into the other [συμπλοκή] . . . It is on the basis of this play or movement that the opposites or differences are stopped by Plato.", 1968: 127). Transgression, responsion, fusion, then, do not represent a new formulation, but rather a familiar one yet to be applied to Horace's iambic. This patterning can be traced in a number of diverse studies on Greek religion and festival worship. Burkert's formative works (1972; 1977; compare Bremmer's, 2007: 141–144, assessment of Meuli, Burkert, and Vernant) contain such descriptors: "aggression / aggressive tensions / human solidarity" (e.g., "A rhythm develops from repetition, and auditory signals accompanying the gestures give rise to music and dance. These, too, are primordial forms of human solidarity [fusion], but they cannot hide the fact that they grew out of aggressive tensions [responsion], with their noise and beating, attack and flight [transgression]," 1972: 24; also *passim* 15–58, 76, 92–93, 212, 223–224, 273–274, 277–293; 1977: 58, 254–255, 258); cf. Nilsson (1951: 17–18); Turner's (1974: 23–59) "social dramas," which through symbols depict tensions producing a movement toward *communitas* and revitalized structures; Gould (1985: 24–25); Cartledge (1985: 116–118); Osborne (1990: 32–

paradigm, his iambic in the complexity of its song simulates the reformation of *societas* without the need for basing it on a monolithic and fixed platform, which may preclude creativity and renovation.[16] Transgression, the act of crossing over one's own and/or another's physical, social, ideological markers, admits differences and, as is the case in iambic, can involve the use of hard words (mockery abusive, explicit, and obscene).[17]

37) on the role of competitions at Athenian festivals; Seaford's discussion (1994: xii–xvii) of transvestism in the *Bacchae* and the "festival pattern of outward procession (πομπή), contest/gathering (ἀγών), and κῶμος," 273–274; Parker (1996: 1, n. 1): "pressure towards harmony by shared participation"; Forsdyke (2005: 73–74, 84–91) on the negative consequences for failed reciprocity; Scullion (2007: 202); Hendrick (2007: 290–295); Halliwell on Theophrastus (2008: 237–238), on the *Knights* (258–263, 298). I would like to be as clear as possible with definitions and yet not reduce religious experience to an analytical system (cf. Nilsson, 1940: 6). It is in the inextricability of experience that ritual and poetry meet. I have also tried to construct descriptions that do not imply that "human solidarity" should be restricted to uniform conformity rather than a strong interdependence formed out of similarities and differences, such as in the human family.

16 Defining "ritual" is a controversial enterprise. I, like Hardin (1983: 851), am satisfied with Victor Turner's attempt (1967: 19): "prescribed formal behavior for occasions not given over to technological routine, having reference to beliefs in mystical beings or powers." Festival worship, marked by inversion of norms and participation by all ranks of society, became a means to confront and change social hierarchies. Such ritual appealed to the disenfranchised and was perceived as a threat by the establishment (How and Wells, 1912: (2) 344; Dodds, 1944: 128; Ladurie, 1974: 192–197; N. Davis, 1975: 28–37; Burkert, 1977: 259, 291; Burke, 1978: 203–204; Seaford, 1994: 244). Compton (2006: 342–345) includes among other evidence (Hdt. 1.23–24; Arist. *Pol.* 6.1319b; Plu. *de cupiditate divitiarum* 527d) Horace's *Epist.* II.1.139–155. He speculates that the farmers were aiming their Fescennine verses at more respected homes (for such Greek rituals [the "Swallow Song," Theog. Hist. *FGrH* F1 = *PMG* 848], see Burkert, 1977: 100–102); compare the incidents at Megara where, according to Plutarch (*Moralia* 295d, 304e–f; dependent perhaps on Aristotle, *Pol.* 1302b30–31), an unruly democracy harassed the rich (on the nature of this evidence, see Forsdyke, 2005: 73, 78–80).

17 "Transgression" is commonly equated with violating social and/or religious standards (see Parker, 1983: 8), and so verbal transgression is often associated with aischrology, "to name with shameful words" (φυλάττου δὲ καὶ τὰς αἰσχρὰς πράξεις μὴ αἰσχροῖς ὀνόμασι λέγειν, *Rhet. Alex.* 35.18.1–2; cf. Plin. 4.14.4: *erit eruditionis tuae cogitare summos illos et gravissimos viros qui talia scripserunt non modo lascivia rerum, sed ne verbis quidem nudis abstinuisse*), that is without a tendency to metaphor and innuendo (Arist. *Rhet.* 1405b8–17; see Halliwell, 2004: 119–122, 2008: 219–221; compare Carey, 2009: 150–151, 155–158). All euphemisms aside, this would be what landed George Carlin in jail for spouting off "seven dirty words" at Summerfest, July 21, 1972. Transgression in this sense, however, is only one aspect in Horace's presentation of iambic. The definitions given, therefore, are meant to encompass both negative and positive aspects of transgression (cf. laughter's "unstable association with positive and negative emotions," Halliwell, 2008: 11–14; also "social affirmation" and "goal-directed shaming," 204; "transmuting of transgression into play," 323) and any aggression associated with it (Storr, 1968: introduction). Since transgression unsettles and can bring conflict/punishment, it is typically felt to be a negative act, but once reparation begins to occur positive outcomes become

It unsettles, because, when a breach occurs, familiar divisions give way, often inducing vulnerability. The response can be one-dimensional: conflict can be prevented or eventually ended by one side submitting to the other. Transgression, however, also has the potential to produce responsion: the interaction of varied perspectives and values in such a way that none easily dominates the other (intended synonyms: answering back and forth; exchange, correspondence).[18] Out of the resulting friction, fusion becomes possible: the participants are led to gain out of the opposition some sense of mutualism, μέθεξις; συμπλοκή (intended synonyms: resolution; consonance; complicity; diversified plurality). In terms of his iambic praxis, Horace crosses opposing characters, perspectives, and emotions (transgression), forcing them to coexist and interrelate within the confines of a single song and poetry books (responsion). Once he pins the conflicts within a single interpretive space, he creates the opportunity for them to coalesce into a new meaningful whole (fusion). Comprehending his iambic, therefore, requires understanding and assessing multiple points of view, and discovering the potential connections between them. The song will not cohere without the divergences being heard and brought into relationship. Accordingly, Horace's Roman transgressions are frequently "intergroup" (patron / client; poet / critic;

possible (compare Foucault, 1977: 35–36). Thus, for example, scapegoat rituals are simultaneously positive and negative. The ritual accomplishes the purification, restoration of the community, but that is predicated on someone's suffering and death. Horace tends to separate his iambic idea from the negative because his emphasis on responsion and fusion precipitates an understanding that does not then require a final expulsion or infliction of suffering.

[18] For Aristotle, the virtue in joking, making-laughter, is its responsive nature, which makes it a vehicle for social-interaction (*EN* 1121a1–2, 18, *Pol.* 1336b16–23; Halliwell, 2008: 310–320). Burkert, 1972: 29: "Ritual as a form of communication, is a kind of language … it is at the same time an extremely social phenomenon: it brings about reciprocal personal contact and preserves it." When Burkert (1972: 23) summarizes Konrad Lorenz's work (a formative biological study on ritualization, 1963), he highlights ritual's function as communication. "In the triumph ceremony [of graylag geese] communication is reciprocal and is strengthened by the reactions of each side ("Rückkoppelung"). But it can also be one-sided, as, for example, when a threatening gesture is answered by ritual submission, which thus upholds a hierarchy." Regardless Burkert concludes: "Above all, then, ritual creates and affirms social interaction (den sozialen Kontakt)." I think the iambic Horace would prefer the reciprocal triumph ceremony. On the point of responsion, Vergil's pastoral and Horace's iambic find common ground (ecl.3.58–59: *incipe, Damoeta; tu deinde sequere, Menalca./alternis dicetis; amant alterna Camenae*; ecl. 7.5, 13: *et cantare pares et respondere parati*; *Minicius, eque sacra resonant examina quercu*). Ecl. 3 is the only time Vergil names the *Camenae*; cf. Horace's praise for the *Eclogues* (*molle atque facetum / Vergilio annuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae*, *S.* I.10.44a–45); n.b. Horace's unelided *atque*, used more in Vergil's earlier poetry.

noble / upstart; witch / innocent boy; male / female) so that the dividing lines between entities can be questioned and in the process of this testing the differences between "them" and "us," without being removed, can be fully appreciated and coordinated.[19]

This is why we often question the unity within and among Horace's songs and this is how his iambic criticism pushes his reader away from the monolithic stance of opposition (violated / vengeful) underlying the Archilochean-Lykambid iambic tradition.[20] For example, when invective is fully divorced from its ritual contexts and used in the courtroom, it tends to become heavily "Lykambid," an aggressive strategy meant to shame, isolate, and gain submission. After all, a lawyer's goal is to win (Cicero's *movere*). Therefore, it is a dangerous tactic for an orator because, unlike a ritual participant, he is using the medium to harm and consequently risks being seen as malicious.[21] Horatian iambic, on the contrary, neither denies nor surrenders to conflict, as well as the emotions that accompany it, as much as his iambic validates and then subsumes it into a dialogue, a conversation in which opposition/criticism can prove constructive.[22] I would say transformative, since an iambic based in the

---

[19] Clarke (2007: 231) gives a comparable analysis of sexual transgression in Roman art.

[20] Compare Derrida (1968: 67) on Plato's *Phaedrus*: "The hypothesis of a rigorous, sure, and subtle form is naturally more fertile. It discovers new chords, new concordances; it surprises them in minutely fashioned counterpoint, within a more secret organization of themes, of names, of words. It unties a whole *sumplokē* patiently interlacing the arguments."

[21] To gain his audience's good-will and offset the harshness of his scurrility against Clodia, Cicero casts his blame as a comedy on a festival occasion (Geffcken, 1973; Corbeill, 2002: 197–218). Demosthenes (*De Corona*), however, turns the tables on aischrologic ritual, when he takes advantage of its reciprocal nature and launches a counter-attack against his opponent Aeschines. He blames Aeschines for employing an immoderate type of festive mockery, which marks him as an exceptionally out-of-place low-class performer (18.122–124); compare Halliwell's exegesis (2008: 227–237).

[22] Could the "fusion" Horace's iambic achieves be complete enough that it represents what Foucault posits as "the possibility of a non-dialectical language" (1977: 40–44, "Most of all, he discovers that he is not lodged in his language in the same fashion and ... a void has been hollowed out in which a multiplicity of speaking subjects are joined and severed, combined and excluded," 42; cf. "an event of multiple values," 50) or foreshadows Blanchot's "contestation" and "nonpositive affirmation" (Blanchot, 1948; 1962; 1969; cf. Foucault, 1966: 16–19; Gregg, 1994: 10–17)? My sense is that Foucault's use of "contestation" (1977: 36) is not the precise equivalent of transgression (cf. Gutting, 1994: 22). Transgression according to Foucault is a "flash" (33), which implies that "crossing" has almost no temporality. I suggest that contestation is as it were in the aftermath of the flash, when limits proceed into limitlessness. If that is the case, then "fusion" is "limitlessness" and "contestation" is "responsion," the reciprocity birthing fusion. More

process of transgression, responsion, fusion advances resolution, a transitioning from a stance of division and brokenness to the consideration of a diversified unity (*polyeideia*). On this basis, generic variety and how it alters expressions of rage become essential features in Horace's iambic criticism. This is the outcome—thinking through ("listening to") how Horace forms differences into a whole teaches an attitude counter to a "versus-you" mindset, which in turn defuses the motivation for anger and retaliation evident in warring. Therefore, the mechanism for realizing resolution is Horatian song itself. It is not just that Horace's iambic expresses rage but that it does so by discounting an iambic that sings at / against you in favour of formulating song with you (μέθεξις).[23] To put the matter another way, Horace's commitment to iambic *polyeideia* counters the commitment to division or domination that fuels warring.[24]

Horace utilizes this junction between his *Epodes* and *Odes* (*carmina*): both are acts of responsion, forms of song in which multiple perspectives resound back and forth to each other. This commonality between

---

related to Horace's immediate contexts, his iambic criticism overall is compatible with Philodemus' views in *On Frank Criticism* and *On Anger*. Insults and any accompanying laughter can be constructive within friendship and society. Rage, self-indulgent anger nursed only for vengeance, is never a good; frank speaking will only inflame emotions unless the speaker cares for the person corrected (Phld. *Ir.* col. i.21–24; col. xliv.5–35; *Lib.* col. xvib.1–6; fr. 44, 82, 60; col. ib, cited by Fish, 2004: 114–118, 132, in his analysis of Philodemus' theory; cf. Halliwell, 2008: 323, on Arist. *EN* 1128a22–24, 30); see also Konstan, 1988: n.b. the "Introduction" by C.E. Glad; White, 2004: 103–130, "State of the Manuscript" for PHerc. 1471, Περὶ παρρησίας, including a helpful series of tables; Armstrong's, 2004: 9–15, brief synopsis of Philodemus' "aesthetics complex": *On Poetry*; *On Music*; *On Rhetoric*; *On Death*; *On The Good King*; *On Anger*; *On Frank Speaking*; also Tsouna's work on Philodemus' ethics, 2007: 195–238. This ideal is balanced by the evidence that Epicureans did jeer and laugh at other philosophers inside and outside their own group (Plu. Mor. 420b; Cic. *N.D.* 1.93; D.L. 10.7–9), which can be read as expressing their own freedom from error (καὶ λοιδορῶν ὁ Μετρόδωρος ἐπιλέγει τοῖς εἰρημένοις διὸ καὶ καλῶς ἔχει τὸν ἐλεύθερον ὡς ἀληθῶς γέλωτα γελάσαι ἐπί τε δὴ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις …, Metrod. fr. 32 Körte, Plu. *adv. Colotem*. 1127C) and corrective rather than purely derisive; compare Halliwell's exempla, 2008: 358–359, arguing for an Epicurean "relish for mockery."

[23] I use "resolution" also in the musical sense, the transition from dissonance to consonance, relating it to social discourse, the realization of cohesion through social-interaction; cf. *verba loquor socianda chordis*, *C.* IV.9.4 (*infra* Chapter 5). So Aristotle refers to laughter and the exchanging of jests as "well-tuned," ἐμμελής, *Rhet.* 1381a35–36; *E.N.* 1128a1; cf. the slave girl mocking Thales, Pl. *Tht.* 174a5. In an eastern tonal system (ancient Greek lyric) the convergences would be more complex and therefore transitions keenly felt. See on μέθεξις, Maranhão, 1986: 135–144; Rowe and Schofield, 2000: 20–21. On the breakdown of μέθεξις and the consequences for art and society, see Chapter 6.

[24] Girard (1972: 20–24) gives three categories for curing the cyclic nature of revenge in their order of effectiveness: (1) the diversion of violence onto substitutes; (2) restricting

iambic and lyric is as old as the lyre itself. When Hermes created the lyre (Hom. *h. Merc.* 50–56), he fashioned the body for the instrument, then strung it, and plied every string until they resounded together (ἐπὶ δὲ ζυγὸν ἤραρεν ἀμφοῖν, / ἑπτὰ δὲ *συμφώνους* ὀΐων ἐτανύσσατο χορδάς./ … ἣ δ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς σμερδαλέον *κονάβησε*, "to echo back and forth," 50–54; cf. Hermes performance for Apollo and Apollo's corresponding laughter, ἣ δ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς σμερδαλέον *κονάβησε*, γέλασσε δὲ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων / γηθήσας, 420–421a; Horace's opening to his *Hymn to Hermes*, *C.* III.11.3–4: *tuque, testudo,* ***resonare*** *septem / callida nervis*). The first song the god improvised to the accompaniment of his new invention was like the competitive exchanges of lampoons at festivals (θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδεν / ἐξ αὐτοσχεδίης πειρώμενος, ἠΰτε κοῦροι / ἡβηταὶ θαλίῃσι παραιβόλα κερτομέουσιν, 54b–56; cf. ὅτι ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ τούτῳ ἰάμβιζον ἀλλήλους, Arist. *Po.* 1448b32; δυνάμενοί τε σκώπτεσθαι καὶ *ἐμμελῶς* σκώπτοντες, Arist. *Rhet.* 1381a34–35).[25] Within the aetiology of the *Hymn*, the iambic mode (θαλίῃσι παραιβόλα κερτομέουσιν) is the model (ἠΰτε) through which the novelty of the lyre and its reciprocal sounds, its music and attendant songs and dances, could be comprehended, a paradigm Horace replicates with the conjunctions between his *carmina*. I am not, therefore, judging the "lyrical" so much by the modern sense of a privatized subjectivity but by its capacity to coordinate diverse elements, which is more in keeping with its archaic and communal contexts.[26]

---

vengeance by compensations; (3) the judicial system. In civil warring, when the judicial system proves dysfunctional, then what? Horace is imagining a fourth category, the artistic formulation of a cohesive *polyeideia*, which is possibly more powerful than the other three. Cf. Hornblower's examples (2009: 53–55) for lyric poets as agents of conflict mediation and social change: "*stasis*-dissolver."

[25] When the infant Hermes wanders out of the cave and spots the soon-to-be-lyre tortoise, he laughs. When Apollo hears Hermes play the lyre, he laughs back. Halliwell (2008: 15 n.35, 313) comments that Apollo's laughter is "an instinctively joyous response to (and almost antiphonal echo of) the sound of the lyre" and describes the harmony within reciprocal jesting as a "kind of verbal dance" (ἐμμέλεια). Compare Pan's invention of the shepherd's pipe in Vergil's ecl. 2, a song Horace cites by title (*o crudelis*, 2.6; *C.* IV.10.1): *Pan primum calamos cera coniungere pluris / instituit*, 32–33a; *est mihi disparibus septem compacta cicutis / fistula*, 36–37a. Corydon is alone in the woodland hills singing a useless "unfinished" song for his Alexis (*ibi haec incondita solus / montibus et silvis studio iactabat inani*, 4b–5). The song and the love remain incomplete as long as Alexis refuses to reciprocate (*o crudelis Alexi, nihil mea carmina curas?*, 1; *mecum una in silvis imitabere Pano canendo*, 31). Corydon's despair is that he is left to perform a solo, taken up only by the shrill cicadas (*at mecum raucis … sole sub ardenti resonant arbusta cicadis*, 12–13).

[26] Miller (1994: 9–29) also challenges the standard assumption that archaic Greek

The Horatian iambic-lyric aesthetic ultimately concerns phenomenology. Songs formed out of responsions are predicated on listening. "To be heard" or "to listen to" becomes an act of progressive understanding, which leads Jean-Luc Nancy (2002: 3–4; 10) to posit that phenomenology would be better grounded in listening than seeing:

> ... shouldn't truth itself as transitivity and incessant transition of a continual coming and going, ***be listened to*** rather than seen? But isn't it also in the way that it stops being "itself" and identifiable, and becomes no longer the naked figure emerging from the cistern but the ***resonance*** of that cistern—or if it were possible to express it thus, the ***echo*** of the naked figure in the open depths?
>
> In still other words the visual is tendentially mimetic and the sonorous is tendentially methexic, that is having to do with *participation, sharing, or contagion*, which does not mean that these tendencies do not intersect.

Nancy applies the relationship of "being" with its object to the relationship between listening and seeing: seeing would be associated with an object but listening could be connected with "being." Listening, therefore, precedes seeing, manifestation, and includes appreciating the variety that lies within the consciousness of the whole—hearing the echoes (the very being) that make up as it were a *sym*phony.[27] "Aesthetic" in turn, then, involves a type of pluralism, when differing sounds / ideas, themselves subject to constant mutation, are in a sense socialized so that they come together, and the artist is the model listener.

"lyric" (Archilochus) "represents a shift away from a communal to an individual consciousness"; cf. Hornblower, 2009: 52–53; Carey, 2009: 159–160. Davis (2010: 105–127) identifies intersections between Horatian lyric and Archilochus, but restricts these to "non-iambic" poetry ("not outright invective," 105). These intersections constitute a "lyric ethos," similar value related content: "an emotional calculus for dealing with vicissitude ..., the sympotic response as an antidote to misfortune and hardship, the preservation of life in the here and now ..., the appeal to abnormal natural phenomena as furnishing lessons for enlightened human conduct, the proclamation of allegiance to Dionysus as the sponsor of inspired *poēsis*, the disavowal of excessive wealth."

[27] The climactic moment in the Eleusinian mysteries was the revelation of the reunited Demeter and Kore, but before this "seeing" the blinded initiates first listened to the lamentations of mother mourning for her lost child and the constant reverberations of the hierophants gong. Through the sense of listening, they participated in the sufferings of the goddesses (Δήμητρος γὰρ ἀφικομένης εἰς τὴν χώραν, ὅτ' ἐπλανήθη τῆς Κόρης ἁρπασθείσης, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς προγόνους ἡμῶν εὐμενῶς διατεθείσης ἐκ τῶν εὐεργεσιῶν, ἃς οὐχ οἷόν τ' ἄλλοις ἢ τοῖς μεμυημένοις *ἀκουὺειν*, Isoc. Panegyricus 28.4–7; Clinton, 2007: 353–354). Compare with Nancy, Derrida (1968: 126): "The element-medium will always be analogous to a mixed-medium"; Foucault (1977: 44–49) on the "eye"; Halliwell (2008: 14–16) on the "tonal vibrancy" and "complex resonance" of laughter.

If this rubric holds for Horace's iambic criticism, it should be applicable to his prime iambic character. "Contagion, participation, sharing" / transgression, responsion, fusion epitomize Horace's relationship with Canidia (*S.* I.8; epodes 3; 5; 17). In most ways she represents well the ritual figure of the scapegoat (*katharma*; *peripsema*; *pharmakos*), a group-member whose humiliation—mocking, beating, expulsion, death—cleanses the community from its impurity and saves it from calamity.[28] She embodies the blackness and crime from which the Romans must be purged (the compulsion for vengeance and the willingness to feed off of each other, epodes 7; 16). A witch, she is a fringe element in society, unlikable and revolting, a ready target for elimination like the average criminal or the Achaeans' deformed Thersites (*Hom.* Il. 2.212–277).[29] She is a druggist (*S.* I.8; II.1.45; 8.94–95; epode 3.7b–8; 5; 17), a liminal figure able to harm and cure (φάρμακον = poison; φάρμακον = remedy).[30]

---

[28] Bremmer (1983: 300–303) provides a concise review of the primary evidence for the ritual among the Greeks, and the attributes of a scapegoat have been well reviewed (among the Cambridge Ritualists, J.E. Harrison, 1903: 95–119, and Frazer, 1913; more recently, and without some of the excesses, by Weichers, 1961: 31–42; Derrida, 1968: 130–133; Girard, 1972: 9–10, 12, 37–38, 296–298; 1982; Vernant, 1972: 87–119; Burkert, 1977: 82–84; 1979: 59–77, 168–176; Bremmer, 1983: 299–320; Parker, 1983: 24–29, 257–280; Hughes, 1991: 139–165; Seaford, 1994: 312–318; Ogden, 1997: 15–46; Nagy, 1999: 279–290). There are a number of variations depending on the ritual context (slave, stranger, outcast, villain, noble, volunteer; death, exile, symbolic degradation), but the consistent premise of this ritual complex is that the scapegoat, embodying the offense, must be separated from the community (see Parker: 329–331).

[29] Nagy's identification of Thersites with scapegoat ritual has been picked up by broader discussions on heroism and Greek laughter (Nagy, 1979: 259–264; Thalmann, 1988: 1–28; Halliwell, 2008: 40–41, 51–99); cf. the fabulist Aesop as scapegoat (Ar. *V.* 1446–1448; *Pax* 129–132; Arist. *Constitution of the Delphians* fr. 487 Rose; Lucian *VH* 2.18; *Vita Aesopi* G and W; Pap. Oxy. 1800; Pap. Soc. Ital. 1094; Weichers, 1961: 31–42; Nagy, 1979: 279–288). I call out the Thersites-scene because it has particular parallels with the *Epodes*. When Odysseus beats Thersites and rallies the Achaeans with his speech, they are saved from becoming oath-breakers (Il. 2.284–288), Lykambes' reported offense (epode 6.13). Thersites' mockery and subsequent humiliation occur after Agamemnon's proposal that the Greeks should give up on Troy and sail home (*Il.* 2.1–211), an interesting coincidence with the end of the *Epodes*, when Horace proposes that the Romans should sail to the Blessed Isles and then sings with the ugly Canidia (epodes 16; 17).

[30] Both the noble boy (epode 5.5) and Horace (epode 17.49–52) appeal to Canidia as if she might have a nurturing side. The first exemplum Horace uses to persuade Canidia to relent is Telephus, who was wounded and cured by Achilles' spear (epode 17.8–10). "He that wounds shall make whole" (see Compton, 2006: 4, n.5). The symbolic value of the scapegoat complex (*pharmakos*) brings together the opposing senses of *pharmakon* ("poison; cure"). The *pharmakos* takes on the contagion of the communal impurity (poison) and so becomes the community's cure by being removed (Derrida, 1968: 133; Girard, 1972: 95, 288; Parker, 1983: 259; Miller, 1994: 35). Derrida contends (95–119) that Plato, when he calls the sophists "poison" and Socrates "remedy" with the same

She could be wrapped up in this ritual package and cast away (κάθαρμα) except that the iambic Horace neither expels nor silences her; he makes song with her (epode 17).[31] Horace and *his* Canidia listen to each other, and her half of the song begins and ends with questions, which, however rhetorical in tone she delivers them, allow for response (17.53–81). This is where Horace closes his *Epodes*. No matter how close his symbiosis with Canidia (both are blame artists), his interactions with her show that his iambic criticisms are of a different sort if they can successfully incorporate, create echoes among, alternative perspectives.[32] Consequently, I

---

word (*pharmakon*), creates within the taxonomy of the *pharmakos* an associative effect between deceitful and sound philosophy (cf. Girard, 1972: 296). "And Socrates' bite is worse than a snake's since its traces invade the soul. What Socrates' words and viper's venom have in common, in any case, is their ability to penetrate and make off with the most concealed interiority of the soul" (118). The irony, then, in Socratic dialogue is found in one *pharmakos* answering back to the other, and how the one can be distinguished in the other (119, 124). This contestation and its irony have much in common with the song shared by Horace and Canidia (epode 17). Derrida's arguments draw heavily from the *Phaedrus*, which by its reference to Stesichorus' palinode is in the background of Horatian iambic (epode 17, Chapter 4; *C.* I.16, Chapter 5). Later (Chapter 4) I will argue that the multiplex structuring of the *Phaedrus* represents the responsive dynamic of dialectic, and therefore is a vital intertext for Horace's iambic criticism. Plato's arguments in the *Phaedrus* against writing, however, do not restrict it to a malicious *pharmakon*; rather Plato recognizes a deficient writing ("to repeat without knowing") when it is overly determined and disallows the responsion (συμπλοκή) evident in dialectic; Derrida, 1968: 75–84; 142–171, n.b. 103–104.

[31] Conversing (speaking/listening) is an intimate step beyond seeing in the erotic *quinque lineae*: *videre*, *[al]loqui*, *osculari*, *amplecti*, *coitus* (Ach. Tat. 2.3.1–2.4.3; Plaut. *Merc.* 744–745; Cic. *Cael.* 49; Ov. *Met.* 10.341–345). The crisis of the *Epodes*, what motivates most of the book's controversy, is that Canidia not only survives but survives well. Worman (2008: 5) describes the collection of *Epodes* as "vitriolic confrontation between the poet and his alter ego, the bitter witch Canidia." On the degree to which Horace appropriates Canidia's tactics, see the fuller discussion by Barchiesi (2009: 246) and *infra*, Chapter 4, epode 17. Exchange in song (composite song) is one of the ways Horace injects a "phonocentricism" into his written and read lyric (Lowrie: 1997: Chapters 2 and 3; Barchiesi, 2009b: 329; compare Eidinow, 2009: 84–85).

[32] Nagy (1979: 260–261) on Thersites: "Thersites is the most inimical figure to the two prime characters (Achilles, Odysseus) of Homeric Epos *precisely because it is his function to blame them. …* Similarly, Thersites in the *Iliad* gets blame for having given blame." Compton (2006: 37–40: "Aesop as Satirist"; cf. Wiechers, 1961; Ogden, 1997: 38–46) extends the characterization to poets and the tradition of their exile (e.g., Archilochus, Hipponax, Sappho). Blame poetry presents the satirist / iambist as a scapegoat, whose silencing would spare the community a damaged reputation (also Miller, 1994: 35). Thus, the satirist / iambist is simultaneously both the pain and pleasure for society, its poison and cure; cf. "scratching an itch," Pl. *Phlb.* 46a ("This type of painful pleasure, linked as much to malady as to its treatment, is a *pharmakon* in itself. It partakes of both good and ill, of the agreeable and disagreeable," Derrida, 1968: 99–100). Such is the iambist's itch and it accounts for Horace's "defensive cast" (Compton, 2006: 356). Certainly Horace

intend to test a thesis, a reading in which Horace's *Epodes* and his transition to the *Odes* may be more than partisan (a move to consolidate Octavian's victory by attacking his enemies, projecting hostilities onto powerless others, and then leaving the rage behind) but a meta-partisan project (the drive to create a functional unity, a plurality, out of diverse and fractured entities). Specifically, when Horace writes iambic, he would be performing an act of social criticism and reconstruction. If so, then he models through his *iambi* the constructive force within transgression, which would be his *iambikē poiēsis* for Rome.

Iambikē Poiēsis: *Action and Continuity*

Iambikē poiēsis is modified Aristotle (τῆς ἰαμβικῆς ἰδέας ... ποιεῖν). According to Aristotle, Crates was the first of the Athenian poets to experiment with making comic plot lines:

> οἱ ἐφ' ἑκατέραν τὴν ποίησιν ὁρμῶντες κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν οἱ μὲν ἀντὶ τῶν ἰάμβων κωμῳδοποιοὶ ἐγένοντο, οἱ δὲ ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπῶν τραγῳδοδιδάσκαλοι ... (*Po.*1449a3–5)
>
> Each one took after these two types of poiēsis according to their natural bent: some became comic instead of iambic poets; others became producers of tragedies instead of epic poets.

> τῶν δὲ Ἀθήνησιν Κράτης πρῶτος ἦρξεν ἀφέμενος τῆς ἰαμβικῆς ἰδέας καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μύθους. (*Po.*1449b7–9)
>
> Crates was the first of the Athenian poets to abandon the iambic form and generalize his dialogues and plots.

Crates abandoned the iambic form (exchanges of invectives, ὅτι ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ τούτῳ ἰάμβιζον ἀλλήλους, *Po.*1448b32) in favor of developing sustained narratives (καθόλου ποιεῖν λόγους καὶ μύθους).[33] Horace

---

knows how to play the part of the victim; yet, even in his most "defensive" moments (cf. *S.* II.1.59–60: *dives*, *inops*, ... *exsul* / ... *scribam*), he keeps right on itching and scratching, and the reciprocal nature of Horace's iambic argues that the cure is not in silence but song (*carmen*), the complexity with which it is sung and heard.

[33] The origin of Greek comedy is controversial. Halliwell (2008:206–214) cites four reasons that Old Comedy "with its uninhibited personal mockery" could be categorized as ritual laughter: (1) Old Comedy was associated with the festivities for Dionysus, a major context for ritual laughter; (2) Aristotle among others claims that comedy developed out of phallic rituals; (3) the obscenity of Old Comedy parallels the ribaldry of aischrology in ritual; (4) Aristophanes assimilates instances of ritual laughter into his comedies (*Ach.* 237–279; *V.* 1361–1379; *Ra.* 316–459). Aristophanic comedy, however, is not

takes a different approach. He retains the iambic form (ἰαμβική)—shorter exchanges in verse—and yet constructs (ποιεῖν) within the confines of his poetry books a socio-political paradigm for Rome based on responsion, and so consistent with his general poetic theory in the *Ars Poetica*.

Iambikē poiēsis emphasizes two aspects in Horace's formulation of iambic and poetics in general. First, he perceives iambic as a type of action. He does not separate what iambic is from what it does, and what he thinks it should do is contrary to death and murder (*Epist.* I.19.23a–25, 30–31):

Parios ego primus iambos
ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus
Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben.

nec socerum quaerit quem versibus oblinat atris,
nec sponsae laqueum famoso carmine nectit.

I was the first to show Parian iambs to Latium, and I followed Archilochus' meter and vitality, not his content and words hunting down Lykambes.

Alcaeus does not look for a father-in-law to smear with black verse, and for his bride he does not weave a noose out of notorious song.

Horace is ready to characterize his iambic as fully Archilochean in meter and vitality, but when it comes to content he discriminates. Iambic themes are not censured because of any specific content per se (*res* and *verba* are nondescript enough) but on the basis of consequence, what they effect (*agentia Lycamben*). By not following an iambic *agenda* that shames and kills, Horace rejects a tragic outcome for iambic. From a teleological point of view, his iambic will have more in common with the use of invective in ritual and Old Comedy. Ritual travels across bridges (mockery at the bridge over the Athenian Cephisus on the way to Eleusis, Str. 9.1.24; Hsch. s.v. γεφυρίς, γεφυρισταί) and crosses the threshold (the grieving Demeter smiles, only after the goddess, the divine, enters into Metanaira's home and encounters Iambe, Hom. *h. Dem.* 188–189), transitional spaces, which belonging to neither one side nor the other

---

an unfiltered lens for social custom, and therefore Halliwell leaves it open whether Old Comedy was ritual laughter or their relationship was perhaps less direct: comic circumstances were incipient in ritual laughter. Halliwell weighs well the existing evidence, and I would also recommend against a casual assumption that comedy must have developed directly out of iambic and its ritual contexts. Nonetheless, there are basic compatibilities between the two evident in Horatian iambic (e.g., epode 16, see Chapter 4), and Aristotle is a primary source for Horace's views on the origin of drama.

symbolize the moment when separation and suffering can commute into insight and understanding.[34] Comic plots depend on the clash between opposing ideas and emotions, which often involves hard words, admits differences, and exposes vulnerabilities, but by the end of the story there is a resolution where some sense of *homónoia* emerges.[35]

Second, *poiēsis* implies that Horace made his books and the poems within them into an artistic whole, and that he presents his poetic career as a continuity. The leading principle of Horace's poetic theory, which he requires for every composition, could be applied to his own works and life on a full scale: "Finally, let it be anything you want, but at least let it be a single unified whole" (*denique sit quidvis, simplex dumtaxat et unum*, *Ars* 23). The first of these claims (unity within books) meets little resistance. While still recognizing that lyric is performative, song designed for a particular occasion (N.-H., 1970: xxiii–xxiv; Barchiesi, 2009b: 319–335), it is now admitted with some ease that the many cross-references between Horace's songs indicate that he paid attention to how his books read as a whole:

---

[34] There are several bridges to be crossed on the way to Eleusis (at the Athenian Cephisus; at the Rheitoi; at the Eleusinian Cephisus); Burkert (1972: 279): "The joking on that first bridge (γεφυρισμός) does not serve to liberate; it is, rather, a contrast to what is to follow; one must tear oneself loose from this in order to cross the mountain and reach the plain of Eleusis."

[35] So the claims made by the chorus in Aristophanic parabases through its invective/advice tend to promote resolution (e.g., *Av.* 676–800; *Nu.* 518–626; *Vesp.* 1009–1121); cf. Dover (1972: 52–53) on *Ra.* 686–705, 718–737: "The 'good advice' offered to the community by an Aristophanic parabasis, when it is not extolling the merits of the poet himself at the expense of his rivals, tends always to be advice which is acceptable at the level of popular sentiment, even if not always accepted and put into practice. It is acceptable because of its essentially conciliatory character, promoting that *homónoia*, 'community of the mind', which is regarded as strengthening the city against external enemies." But, is resolution as monolithic as Dover here makes it seem? For the responsive nature of the Old Comic parabasis and its connection with social satire, see Hubbard (1991: vii–ix, 20–26), who challenges theories that downgrade the parabasis to a "fossilized" left-over from comedy's supposed ritual origins. Neither does a comic context mean that lampoons and laughter are necessarily safe (cf. Halliwell, 2008: ix, 10, 19–38). Aristotle (*Pol.* 1336b), for instance, recommended excluding children from iambic displays until old enough to attend the symposion. A child, exposed to representations of abuse too early in development, may later as an adult be more prone to illicit behavior (cf. Pl. *Rep.* 8.563a–b). The complexity of iambic, ritual or literary, is that it comes packaged with a wide range of emotions and motivations, some of which might or might not be considered mutually exclusive (Halliwell, 2004: 117–119; 2008: 11). Regarding the problems involved in "emotional" / "psychological categories," see, for example, Campbell (1997), Griffiths (1997), and Ben-Ze'ev (2000).

> Horace's own works are best approached as books of poems with a shape and a strategy, not just as individual poems collected together. Recent scholarship demonstrates the value of so viewing the *Epodes*.
>
> (G. Hutchinson, 2007: 37)[36]

I would add that Horace writes obvious parallels between the beginnings and endings of his books: the priamel in *S.* I.1 returns in *C.* I.1; images of poetic immortality bridge *C.* I.1, II.20, III.30, and IV.3; *non sum qualis eram* (*C.* IV.1.3) parallels *non eadem est aetas, non mens*, line 4 of *Epist.* I.1 where just five verses later Horace resigns from lyric composition, *nunc itaque et versus et cetera ludicra pono*; in *C.* IV.1.5 Horace names *C.* I.19 by title, *Mater saeva Cupidinum*. Horace's habit of using straightforward references to link his books and the time he spends defending why he moves from one genre to another suggest that he expected his audience to read the transitions from book to book and one poetic type to the next.[37]

The conversation over the arrangement and possible unity of Horace's *Epodes* has intensified over the past decade. L.C. Watson (2003: 20) begins his review of the competing positions with a criticism—

> The *Epode* book has been endlessly dissected and analysed in a search for its internal logic and thematic responsions. Too often such analysis has been unsatisfactory, tending to stress form over content or to unearth illusory interconnections.

—to which charge my lawyer would advise me to plea, "nolo contendere" (too late for Trebatius' "*quiescas*," *S.* II.1). Some of the interconnections I draw in the following chapters may prove more / less convincing than others. It is a risk worth taking to move the conversation on Horace's

[36] Recent studies concur that the *Epodes* is an organized thoughtful collection, but continue to disagree over the precise nature of that arrangement and its meaning (Fitzgerald, 1988: 176–181; Heyworth, 1993: 85–96; Porter, 1995: 107–130; Barchiesi, 2001: 141–164; Harrison, 2001: 165–186; Watson, 2003: 20); for a review of the various approaches with ratings of their success, see Thom, 2000: 37–38; Watson, 2003: 20–30. The Roman poets (first century BC) learned the dynamics of the "poetry book" via the Alexandrians, notably Callimachus, modeled, for instance by Meleager in his poetry book (see Gutzwiller, 1998: 320–323); for the influence of Callimachus' *Iambi* on the structure of the *Epodes*, see Scodel (1987: 207). Vergil's *Eclogues* was also a key model for Horace (van Rooy, 1973: 69–88; Leach, 1978: 79–105).

[37] S. Harrison's forthcoming chapter, titled "There and Back Again: Horace's Poetic Career" argues that the thematic spill-over between collections invites a linear reading across Horace's career. I would like to thank Professor Harrison for sharing a preliminary copy of his work. Hubbard (1991: 35) likewise concludes about the high degree of "autoallusion" in Aristophanic parabases: "it shows Aristophanes' dramatic *oeuvre* as a mutually interconnected continuity."

iambic beyond the *Epodes*' structural design (meter and the repetition of certain themes), tone (teasing raillery, harsh invective, iambic weakness ironic or otherwise, entertaining literary repartee), and even whether or not the book exhibits a linear progression (a type of iambic plot-line), although I am most sympathetic with this view.[38] The diversity of meter, theme, and tone, inherited by Horace as a matter of course from the iambic tradition, provides enough latitude for multiple approaches,[39] and each deserves some credit, if for no other reason than they all stem from an interest in Horace's prime conception of iambic and how he saw it functioning within Roman society. This is exactly where Horace's directs his iambic criticism(s). When he denies that his iambic "hunted down Lykambes," he invites questions about its social utility. What should be its proper effect?

Life, Times, and Literature

Setting aside the natural hesitation to regard satire and iambic with their mockery and menace as sociable, why has it been so difficult in the *Epodes* to listen to its complex coherence, admired in Horace's lyrics, and evaluate its significance? The poet's political context, the civil wars and his developing relationship with the political elites, plays a leading role. Horace, writing in literary modes prone to a "prominent I" (satire, iambic, lyric, epistles), works within the expectation that his world informs his poetry, and he reinforces that assumption by telling us more specifics about himself than any other Roman author.[40] What

---

[38] Watson (2003: 20–30) reviews proponents for each category.

[39] Studies (e.g., Henderson, 1987/1999: 103–104; 1999: 3–16; Fitzgerald, 1988: 176–191; Mankin, 1995: 6–14; Watson, 1995: 202; 2003: 7–12; Barchiesi, 2001: 141–164; 2002: 47–69; 2009b: 324–326, 328–331) have begun to expose within the *Epodes* a deep coherence, grounded in the *polyeideia* of the earlier iambic tradition (Nagy, 1976: 191–195; Fedeli, 1978: 104–106; Scodel, 1987: 206–209; Miller, 1994: 9–36; Acosta-Hughes, 2002: 4–9). Consequently, concerns about heterogeneity within the *Epodes* (Shackleton-Bailey, 1982: 8–9) have been replaced by an interest in how Horace employed this multivalence.

[40] Harrison's *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (2007) starts with Nisbet's fine chapter, "Horace: life and chronology." Nisbet begins (7): "Horace says more about himself than any other ancient poet does, and our main source for his life must be his own poems"; cf. Harrison on the prominence of the "I" in Horace's poetry (2007: 22): "Indeed the different poetic genres which constitute his [Horace's] output all seem to have been chosen in part because of the primacy of the poet's voice: Lucilian *sermo* with its strong 'autobiographical' element, Archilochean iambus with its 'personal' invective,

he tells us from the outset in the *Epodes* is that he writes for a patron, who is fighting for Octavian (epodes 1 and 9). Horace swears his loyalty and assures Maecenas that he will prove himself useful (epode 1). The *Epodes* is "promised" song (*inceptos olim, promissum carmen, iambos*, epode 14.7).

Horace's professed allegiance places the *Epodes* within a larger biographical context and triggers a wider set of assumptions for us who know his works from start to finish. His life, as reported, can be reconstructed so that his poetics are micromanaged within the confines of an Augustan political timeline.[41] Horace, a freedman's son, enjoyed a fine education in Rome and Athens (*S*. I.6.71–80; *Epist*. II.2.41–45), a schooling more typical for the young noble. His father, an enterprising businessman, provided the support. While attending lectures in Athens, he came under the influence of Brutus and joined the Republican cause (44 BC). Horace, and the Republicans, had "their wings clipped" at Philippi (42 BC; *unde simul primum me dimisere Philippi, / decisis humilem pennis*, *Epist*. II.2.49–50a) by Antony and Octavian, the latter named Augustus some fifteen years later. In his early to mid-twenties, Horace returned home to find his property confiscated, and he felt forced to depend on his writing skills to earn a living (*inopemque paterni / et Laris et fundi paupertas impulit audax / ut versus facerem*, *Epist*. II.2.50b–52a).[42] Smarting from his losses in the civil war—and likely looking to display a creativity that would win him notice—Horace, beginning to write verse, chose the edgier and less practiced mediums of satire and iambic. His talent earned him the attention and then financial support of the political elites (38–32 BC; *S*. I.6.54–62; epode 1.23–34; *S*. II.6.1–58).[43] In the next few years, Horace, now in his late twenties to early thirties and on the side of the winners rather than the losers, polished off his *Epodes* and *Satires* and turned to the less abrasive but equally experimental project of lyric.

Lesbian 'monodic' lyric with its prominent 'I', and epistolary *sermo* with its inevitably central letter-writer, further layered in the *Ars Poetica* with the didactic voice of the instructor."

[41] E.g., R. Bond (2009: 133) sets out "Horace's Political Journey" as follows: "There are various stages to Horace's political trajectory: republican and survivor, critic, Augustan eulogist and would be 'apolitical' Epicurean recluse."

[42] According to Horace it was his verses that really paid off (compare Suet. *Vita Hor*.: *victisque partibus venia inpetrata scriptum quaestorium conparavit*).

[43] There is general agreement: introduced to Maecenas, 38 BC; received the Sabine farm from Maecenas, 32 BC; cf. Wickham's (1891) introduction to the *Satires*, section 2; Nisbet (1984) 8–9.

His political lyrics reveal "his increasing closeness to the regime."[44] The collection *Odes* I–III was published about the same time as the second constitutional settlement (23 BC), when Augustus was granted *tribunicia potestas* and *imperium maius* basically *in perpetuum*. The "older" Horace (in his forties) finally took a break from lyric and returned to hexameter verse, this time more philosophical in bent: literary epistles and literary criticism (*Epist.* I.1.10–19; II.2.141–144). When Horace (pushing fifty) began to write lyric again, he composed primarily panegyric, the *Carmen Saeculare* and *Odes* IV. This is one perspective (the most popular) on Horace's life and literary career, but is it any more sufficient than the retelling of my own career path as an American Civil War saga?[45]

The *Epodes* was composed during a watershed in the life of Rome and Horace's career. He wrote the poems during different stages in the civil war (Sextus Pompeius; Antony and Cleopatra), and consequently from various perspectives on Octavian (from the early to late 30s BC), but completed the book post-Actium (epode 9).[46] The tendency is to assume that Horace in this shift of before-and-after is playing partisan politics and to

---

[44] Nisbet in Harrison, 2007: 13. Harris (2001) extends this common line of argument to the *Epodes*: "Although the civil wars of the years 49–30 were a time of anger, … Both Vergil (*Eclogues* I and IX) and Horace (*Epodes* VII and XVI) avoid the theme in the political poems they wrote in the 30s" (214). After this cover-up, Horace later praises Caesar Augustus for ending that anger (*C.* IV.15.17–20). Then, Harris labels Horace "a regime poet" (243). I could object that if, as Harris claims (64), Horace associates anger with madness, *furor* (and I would add with *vis*), then the *Epodes* are filled with both (e.g., epode 7.13–14a: *furorne caecus an rapit vis acrior / an culpa?*) and Vergil's later poetry, the *Aeneid*, is loaded with the anger of war (Indelli, 2004: 105–110). I would rather accept the tag "regime poet" for what it rightly implies, that the challenge for Horace is that his association with Augustus cuts both ways: his poetry helps write the Augustan legacy, but the Augustan image in turn effects how he is viewed as a poet. The reputation of the one is encoded into the reputation of the other (see especially, Feeney, 2002: 172–182; 2009: 30–31).

[45] *Symposion of Praise* (Johnson, 2004b) contends that certain assumptions about Augustan patronage obscure Horace's panegyric praxis, which is more multivalent and nuanced than supposed. To stage Horace's career as if it were a three act play [anxiety and pessimism (*Satires* and *Epodes*), accommodation (*Odes* I–III), acquiescence (*Epistles* and *Odes* IV)] is too nice and neat.

[46] The accepted chronology is early 30s (Sextus Pompeius, epodes 7 and 16), late 30s (Antony, epodes 1 and 9). Mankin (1995: 10–11) argues that a reader moving in linear fashion through the book would associate the civil wars of epode 7 with conflicts leading up to Actium (epode 1). This assumption would be reinforced by epode 9 (announcing Octavian's victory) and carry through epode 16. To whichever segment of the civil war a reader may assign epodes 7 and 16, Horace guarantees that the *Epodes* will project a Rome in transition, pre- (epode 1) to post-Actium (epode 9). Placing the victory at Actium so early in the book (epode 9) and returning to the civil wars near the end (epode 16) only prolong the sense of transition, and play up the competing perspectives.

judge his iambic accordingly. For example, the *Epodes* might express the anger and pessimism of Rome during the civil wars in order to underscore the grandeur of Octavian's triumph, or instead might displace any residual animosity toward Rome's new ruling power onto the disenfranchised elements in society, reduced to the status of amusing stock characters: day-dreaming loan sharks, unsatisfied lovers, and spiteful lovesick witches. Whatever tensions exist (thematic or generic) are alleviated by the poet's move from political outsider to insider so that Horatian iambic becomes a product of the poet's political accommodation. What the *Epodes* can mean and iambic can effect become limited by what we imagine the iambist's new "friends" would and would not have approved, what an "insider on the payroll" should and should not say.[47]

The debate goes on about the end of the *Epodes* and to what degree Horace, living and writing through the civil wars, hesitates between optimism (epode 16) and pessimism (epode 17), submission and angry vengeance (Horace and Canidia, epode 17). Vergil replays the same conflicts at the end of the *Aeneid*. Should pious Aeneas accept Turnus' promise of surrender anymore than Canidia should accept Horace's? The controversial endings to the *Epodes* and *Aeneid* are similar, only the *Aeneid* is further past Actium.[48] The poetry of the "Augustans" stays as vital as it does because the authors do not allow their patronage and political loyalties, as important a consideration as these may be, to decide all interpretive issues. Questions remain for Horace, such as how does his later iambic criticism (*Epist.* I.19.19–34; *Ars* 79–82) relate to his earlier poetry, although his socio-political position under which he formulated each had changed. How does the "older Horace" characterize the value of his "youthful" poetry and his choice of genres? Horace's doubletalk is not easy to read. Looking back he says he acted out of anger (*C.* I.16;

[47] Suet. *Vita Hor.*: *ac primo Maecenati, mox Augusto insinuatus non mediocrem in amborum amicitia locum tenuit.* Should *insinuatus* be translated by the bland "was recommended to," which is what Horace says (*S.* I.6), or imply wheedling, "to steal into favor with" (Plaut. *Cist.* 92–93; cf. Cic. *de Or.* 1.90)? Translators of the *Vita* decide both ways. How far we can trust Suetonius on how Horace became an insider and what effect this had on his poetry are open questions (Fraenkel, 1957:1–23; Anderson, 1995:151–164; Hills, 2001: 613–616; Johnson, 2004b: 1–2).

[48] Powell (2008: 23, 29, 185) disputes the assumption that Horace was, as Syme puts it, "safe and subsidized in Rome" (1939: 299), and notes that Vergil is "usually spared such sneers." Neither poet wrote in a period of stability (30s–20s BC): the immediate proximity of the civil wars; the continued negotiations needed to put in place the principate; Augustus' poor health. When they were writing for Maecenas, his poets would not know that Octavian's rule would last as long as it in fact did.

III.14.25–28). Later he sets aside his previous poetry as though it were a childhood plaything (*Epist.* I.1.1–19), and then turns around and gives it a forceful defense (*Epist.* I.19). He feigns humility and makes his poems out to be less than they are (*indigna … scripta … et nugis*, *Epist.* I.19.41–42; *sermones … repentis per humum*, *Epist.* II.1.250–251), but trumpets their immortality (*C.* IV.3; 6.29–44). He complains that he is not the same as he once was and is too old for Venus, while he is writing a potent love lyric (*C.* IV.1). Horace through these shifts makes his career an entertaining and provocative subject.[49] He sings through the times of his and Rome's life, but to what degree might his poetics stay the same through these transitions? Since Horace's iambic criticism spans the length of his career, it affords a chance to connect Horace's very first with his last.[50]

The complications Horace writes into his biography remind that artists have imaginations functioning in tandem with life experience. On one hand, in defense of his *Epodes* Horace stands his life and times ("I was the first to show Latium;" "I the lyricist of Latium," *Epist.* I.19.23–24, 32–33); on the other, the combined creativity of his iambic/lyric predecessors.[51] Horace is translating to Rome what would be for most of his

---

[49] The effort to identify the operational theory behind Horace's self-presentation is on-going (Olienis, 1998: face-making; McNeill, 2001: constructing competing audiences; Sutherland, 2002: training readers). Horace keeps us guessing to what degree we should read him and his life as a character of his own making.

[50] The seeming exceptionality of the *Epodes* is the fundamental complication in assessing Horace's career; cf. Conte, 1994: 296–297: "It is natural to link with this situation of hardship [the defeat at Philippi] Horace's harsh polemics, loaded tones, and violent poetic language. This makes the *Epodes* in many regards an isolated case in Horace's literary writings and gives us an image of the poet far different from the stereotyped one with which Horace has always been associated in European culture (good taste, affability, warm humanity, detachment from passion, sense of proportion)." In essence, the various approaches to the *Epodes* in order to maintain the caricature of the later 'civil Mr. Horace' isolate it from the early Horace.

[51] Attributed to President Harry S. Truman: "Give me a one-handed economist. All my economists say, 'on one hand … on the other.'" Because Horace begins the *Epodes* with such a clear historical and biographical moment (Horace's pledge that he will follow Maecenas to Actium), views of Horace's iambic become caught in a specific definition of the 'Poetic I', which in the act of performance may range from the autobiographical at one extreme to the fictional on the other (see Slings, 1990: 1–30, n.b. 11–16). Nisbet ends his chapter on Horace's life (2007: 21): "… we must be very conscious that our knowledge of him is less than he would have liked us to think." Harrison begins the next chapter (2007: 22–35) by emphasizing that Horace obscures supposed autobiographical moments with literary allusions and elements of fantasy. My "on one hand"—"on the other" acknowledges the need for balance and care in handling the "Horatian biography," as well as allows the artist license for creativity without immediately

contemporaries, including in all likelihood his patrons, an artistic fabrication, an entertaining but foreign, and in many respects, remote tradition. The names Archilochus, Sappho, and Alcaeus, along with Horace's Callimachean language (19.24–31) argue that iambic encompasses more than invective, and we can expect the *Epodes* to reflect the variety of its predecessors.[52] Nonetheless, when Horace refers to the *Epodes* as iambi, associates his iambic with Archilochus, and then immediately disavows Archilochus' reputation as a verbal "hit-man," he is acknowledging, even if implicitly, that the one thing the majority of his audience would most likely know about iambic is that it is a mode of attack intended to humiliate and harm.[53] The challenge that Horace faces is how to work his way beyond this narrow assumption without being viewed as a weak iambist.

Because Horace refuses to identify iambic with Archilochus' murderous verbal assault on the Lykambids (*nec socerum quaerit quem versibus oblinat atris, / nec sponsae laqueum famoso carmine nectit*, *Epist.* I.19.30–31), and so is not acting on a "feud," his invective has been judged more mannered and less pointed than the iambic of his Greek predecessors, Archilochus and Hipponax.[54] It makes little impression that the iambic Horace condemns all Romans (epode 7, 16), assigns names

limiting him because of his patronage. I am suspicious of a poet who will write poetics, such as the Callimachean paradox of "fatness" and "thinness," into the description of his life and physical appearance (*Epist.* I.20.19–28); compare *me libertino natum patre et in tenui re / maiores pennas nido extendisse loqueris* (*Epist.* I.20.20–21) with *Non usitata nec tenui ferar / penna biformis per liquidum aethera / vates* (*C.* II.20.1–3a). Horace says that he is fat and short (*me pinguem*, *Epist.* I.4.15; *corporis exigui*, 20.24a), but note the pun reported by Suetonius (*Vit. Hor.*) that Augustus teased Horace: "the circumference of your scroll is well-rounded just like the distance around your belly." I am also not as sure as Slings that even the original audience could readily determine the definition of the 'Poetic I' based on the performance (e.g., Anac. 360 PMG, Slings, 1990: 15). Hubbard (1991: ix) calls for a "refined synthesis of social and biographical approaches." I would add literary.

[52] Worman (2008: 8–14) gives a concise review of iambic's metrical and thematic diversity.

[53] Before *iambos* ever migrated to Rome, Archilochus and *iambos* were closely associated with invective; see Carey, 2009: 150–151; Rotstein, 2010: 317–319.

[54] See Mankin's (2010: 96–100, 104) criticism of this view and its proponents. He rejects the premise because it disregards the emphasis on friendship in "Parian" iambic. Yet, when Horace cites Archilochus and Hipponax together (epode 6)—for all the differences between the two iambists (reviewed by Carey, 2009: 163–167)—Horace makes them exempla for retaliatory invective. So then, does Horace's iambic turn out to be more bark than bite? Or is too much credence given to Horace's supposed iambic impotence so that a pessimistic and premature conclusion is forced onto the end of the *Epodes* (see *infra*, Chapters 2, 4, and 5)?

(Alfius, epode 2; Canidia, epode 5, 17; Maevius, epode 10; Pettius, epode 11: Inachia, Lesbia, Amyntas of Cos, epode 12; Neaera, epode 15), and addresses Maecenas four times (epode 1, 3, 9, 14).[55] No matter how pointedly relational Horace makes the *Epodes* seem, without the motive of the vendetta he appears to be left playing a literary blame-game, combining Archilochean invective with a more sophisticated, and perhaps softer, Callimachean iambic. Ovid draws this comparison, Archilochus (hard and explicit) and Callimachus (mild and metaphoric), when he claims that he is toning down his iambic to allow his target, "Ibis," the opportunity to avoid a more hostile attack by changing his behavior before his identity and deeds are disclosed:

postmodo, si perges, in te mihi liber iambus
  tincta Lycambeo sanguine tela dabit.
nunc, quo Battiades inimicum devovet Ibin,
  hoc ego devoveo teque tuosque modo.
utque ille, historiis involvam carmina caecis,
  non soleam quamvis hoc genus ipse sequi.
illius ambages imitatus in Ibide dicar
  oblitus moris iudiciique mei. (Ov. *Ibis* 51–58)

Later, if you persist, against you my free-speaking iambic will hurl its weapons, coated with the blood of Lykambes. For now I will curse you and your household in the same way Callimachus curses his enemy Ibis. Like Callimachus, I will wrap my song in veiled stories, although this is not my customary style. It will be said that I imitated the periphrasis of his *Ibis* and disregarded my own convention and practice.

"Ibis" may assume all too readily that Ovid prefers to be Callimachean out of convenience, because the 'Ovid-in-exile' understands how dangerous a "free-minded" confrontation (*liber iambus*, 51) against the powerful can be.[56] At this point the literary tends to lead right back to Horace's patronage. In the process of transferring iambic to Rome, it may be

---

[55] Whether these names are pseudonyms or represent stock characters, they keep the *Epodes* from sounding artificial and distant, and they are no more imaginative than the name *Lykambes* ("wolf-walker;" see Pickard-Cambridge, 1927: 15); on whether Lykambes and his daughters are actual persons, see *infra* (Chapters 1 and 2).

[56] Callimachus' *Ibis* does not survive, but his *Iambi* confirm that Ovid is contrasting the explicit and aggressive nature of Archilochean iambic (cf. *pugnacis iambi*, *Ibis* 519; *postmodo plura leges et nomen habentia verum, / et pede quo debent acria bella geri*, *Ibis* 641–642) with Callimachus' reliance on allusion and metaphor, which along with the elegiac meter changes the tone. By the time Ovid finishes his *Ibis*, and his victim has been sacrificed on an altar (101–106, 463–464), assailed by the furies (155–162, 181–186), and destined by the fates and cursed by the poet to every tragic end imaginable for four hundred lines of verse (239–638), "Ibis" may ask how much change.

presumed that Horace sanitized it, making it more palatable to those Roman elites who were now supporting his work and whom he could not afford to offend, at least too severely. This literary perspective keeps Horace safe, while it imposes by default particular untested limits on the degree and manner in which Horatian iambic criticism hazards playing social politics.

Much of the efficacy in Horatian iambic could be diminished by restrictions imposed on it by an audience assuming certain standards, socio-political or literary. This was the case with Horace's contemporaries. When Horace defends the quality of his *Epodes* (*Epist.* I.19), he sets his own creativity in opposition to popularity and uniformity. He tells Maecenas that he does not "canvass" (*suffragia venor*, 19.37) for readers like a politician handing out free suppers and clothes to would-be voters, nor does he "campaign" (*ambire*, 19.40) to please professional lecturers. Horace will not subject his poetry to politicking.[57] He, instead, emphasizes the originality of the *Epodes* with particular attention to content and outcome (*non res et agentia verba Lycamben*, 19.25), and he advises Maecenas not to award his iambic too small a wreath (*ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes*, 19.26).[58] Horace insists that while being true to his models (both iambic and lyric: Archilochus, Sappho, Alcaeus), he does not ape. That insinuation is the very reason Horace gets mad and turns iambic on copycat poets (*O imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe / bilem, saepe iocum vestri movere tumultus!*, 19.19–20). The imitators are willing no matter what to follow the advice and habits of the one they think the paragon (be a wine-drinker; be a water-drinker; dress like stern Cato; talk like eloquent Timagenes; be pale-faced like Horace, 19.10–18), and

[57] Horace leaves no room for overlooking the political implications of his word choice (I do not "canvass" or "campaign"). He adds that those on the lecture circuit (*grammaticae tribus*), irritated by his refusal to participate in the public recitations, tease him about his private sessions with his Jove/Augustus (… *'rides' ait 'et Iovis auribus ista / servas*, *Epist.* I.19.43–44a). They respond to Horace: "You will not court us, but do court him." Note: Horace allows his imagined interlocutor the sarcasm to name Augustus by the trumped-up title Jove, one more example that the image of the poet and emperor are co-dependent—not in a positive way here. Both are accused of acting too high and mighty, when they know that their success depends on popularity.

[58] Horace's use of *foliis ideo brevioribus* is curious. *Brevis* references not only space ("scanty") but time ("quickly fading"). Maecenas should not underestimate the lasting value of Horace's iambic. Horace is once more trumpeting his poetic immortality (past, present, future): he adds himself onto a venerable tradition (Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho, Callimachus) and argues that he revitalizes iambic for Rome by his own ingenuity. This is not a defense that allows the *Epodes* to be tied too closely to what might in the future be an outdated political objective.

as a result their song has no power to work beyond the standards they accept for themselves and assume for others. Slavish repetition even of the outlandish disallows transgression. It keeps the herd together; it guarantees everyone stays locked within predictable boundaries and limits.[59] The choice presented to society through such song is to fall in line and accept it, or reject and fight.[60]

Horatian iambic is different. It does not mime. It answers back and engages. It requires a singer driven to bring opposed realities into responsion no matter the resistance, be it the friendship and obligations of patronage sending Maecenas and Horace off to war (epode 1) / entertaining Horace at a banquet that leaves him with indigestion (epode 3) / urging Horace to finish his book (epode 14); women whose lust cannot be satisfied so that they need and desire the lovers they berate (epodes 8, 12) / Canidia willing to kill for a love potion (epode 5) / Romans killing each other (epode 7); the loan-shark Alfius lying about wanting to escape to a quiet country-life (epode 2) / the iambist advising his people to abandon Rome for the Blessed Isles (epode 16). Horace's *Epodes* assembles a diverse collection of characters and manages to make one wonder how different they really are from each other. By exposing the tensions in the competing perspectives and bringing them into association, Horace's iambic criticism from first to last (*Epodes*, *Odes*, *Ars Poetica*) does the work of social reconstruction (transgression, responsion, fusion).[61]

Raising Questions

Iambikē poiēsis tests presuppositions. I, therefore, do not intend this study to be definitive, but rather to place Horace's iambic praxis in a position where its positive value can be more openly explored and debated. This is where Horace leaves the matter: he does not declare what following

59 Cf. Lowrie (2009b: 254): Horace is objecting to a view of poetry that reduces it to a law, which can be copied and followed by rote.

60 See also Girard (1972: 51): "At this point in the conflict" [when differences have been eliminated] "one can only say to the combatants: Make friends or pursue your own ruin."

61 On the complex question of the relationship between society and pluralism or whether any society must be pluralistic to some degree, I would refer first to Hendrick's discussion of society (2007: 284–287), based on Durkheim's (1912) definition, that the Greeks viewed "society" as integrated and therefore as a process of politics; second to Girard's argument about the nature of Greek tragedy (1972: 39–67, n.b. 50–51: "sacrificial / social crisis") that violence within a group builds and its structures are threatened when differences are lost. A society's stability could be judged on how it develops and coordinates differences as opposed to "undifferentiation."

Archilochean *animus* means (*animosque secutus / Archilochi*), but leaves his audience to infer by engaging his iambic verse closely and from a broader angle. At times I will use an imagined interlocutor as a reminder that there are competing perspectives on what iambic should be and on how successful Horace is in translating it to Rome.

First, I do not want to sidestep the well-reasoned skepticism asserting the disjunctions between ritual and literary iambic, and questioning to what degree literary iambic (its voice bent on shaming) retains meaningful associations with ritual iambic (its voice tuned toward understanding).[62] This is skepticism with some point, because there is reason to believe both that Horace was well aware of iambic's ritual lineage and that he took advantage of the competing perspectives within ritual and literary iambic. The evidence is circumstantial but compelling.[63]

---

[62] See, e.g., Bowie (2001: 3), who reminds that ritual and literary contexts are not to be equated: "This story [Iambe and Demeter] … does not demonstrate that the genre *iambos* had ritual origins. It is compatible both with the hypothesis that *iambos* began in a ritual context and then became secular, as it clearly has become by the generation of Archilochus and Semonides …"; also Carey, 2009: 151; on the tendency to hyper-ritualize the arts, see Hardin, 1983: 846–862. Parker (1983: 1, 13–16) poses a parallel question for tragedy, whether *miasma* is a "literary mechanism" or a "living preoccupation." The problem merits consideration, as long as its difficulty is not underestimated. Since in archaic Greece, poetry exists within ritual and ritual within poetry, both symbolic systems, it is hard to delineate strictly ritual from literary and sacred from secular. Add in that Archilochus refers to himself as a servant of Ares (1 W) and the leader of Dionysus' dithyramb (120 W); for a fuller review of the evidence connecting Archilochean iambic to ritual, see Chapter 1. Easterling (1985: 46), commenting on Apollo calling the gods to song and dance (Hom. *h. Apoll.* 183–206), notes: "… this ideal picture of divine activity mirrors what human poets and musicians and their bands of singers and dancers did in real life, and thereby it makes a great claim for the divine power of human poetry." Seaford (1994: xiv) complains, "And both genres [epic; tragedy] evoke ritual to an extent that makes the general failure to investigate ritual on the part of literary and textual critics a puzzling phenomenon, not entirely explicable by the long-since unfashionable excesses of the Cambridge school." T. Harrison (2007: 374), citing Parker (1997: 148), suggests going further and "declaring that the various imaginary worlds of Greek literature themselves *constitute* Greek religious experience."; see also Robertson, 1985: 155–190.

[63] Again Horace's *Hymn to Mercury* (*C.* III.11.3–4) and its close rendering of Homer's *Hymn to Hermes*, when the god invents the lyre (vv.51–56), establishes that Horace knew the lyre's association with iambic exchanges at festivals (see *supra*). Ovid also retains the ritual context for his *Ibis*. Before he begins his curses proper, he invokes all the deities of sky, earth, and earth below (65–94), proclaims himself priest (*peragam rata vota sacerdos*, 95b), calls his audience to reverent attendance (*quisquis ades sacris, ore favete, meis*, 96), and presents his victim at the altar as a funereal sacrifice (*tu quoque, quid dubitas ferales sumere vittas? / iam stat, ut ipse vides, funeris ara tui. / … da iugulum cultris, hostia dira, meis.*, 101–106). The sacral preface to the curses is about seven percent of the whole *Ibis*.

About three hundred years after Hipponax, four hundred after Archilochus, and within the learned society of Hellenized Egypt, Callimachus develops for his *Iambi* a ritual context. Callimachus' first *iambos* starts by bringing Hipponax back from the dead.[64] In the voice of Hipponax, Callimachus summons the Alexandrian *litterati* (φιλολόγουϲ, *Diegesis* ad 1.3) to a temple of Serapis and calls them to holy silence before he relates a parable about the seven sages, who, unlike the *litterati*, refused to fight over status but out of mutual respect chose association over dis-association and enmity. While telling the story, Callimachus/Hipponax frequently invokes the gods. The result of Callimachus' consistent attention to ritual is that the iambist acts the part of a priest calling the people, the arrogant *litterati*, to a different way of living. Therefore, when Horace disavows the Lykambid tradition of Archilochean iambic (*non res et agentia verba Lycamben*, *Epist.* I.19.25b) by imitating Callimachus' qualified simulation of Hipponax (φέρων ἴαμβον οὐ μάχην ἀείδοντα / τὴν Βουπάλειον, *Iamb.* 1.3–4a [fr. 191] Pf.), this link between Horace's *apologia* for his iambic and Callimachus, one of several to be noted in Chapter 1, indicates that Horace was versed in iambic's "ritualized" context, if only through Callimachus.

Also, Horace's defense of his own iambic is more than a rejection of a "rough and tough" Archilochean iambic in favor of a "milder" Callimachean. Callimachus distinguished his voice from Hipponax and his warring against Bupalus; yet at the same time Callimachus spoke through him, and when he did Hipponax-Callimachus stood and squared off against an infuriated contemporary audience.[65] Callimachus (*Iamb.* 1) was in a hostile situation. The Alexandrian *litterati*, in iambic fashion, swarmed (εἰληδὸν [ἐϲ]μεύουϲιν, *Iamb.* 1.28 [fr. 191] Pf.) around like flies and wasps, like Delphians greedily devouring a sacrifice (cf. Horace's characterization of his imitators, *Epist.* I.19–23: "servile beast-pack," *servum pecus*; "uproar," *tumultus*; "a leader confident in himself will rule the swarm," *qui sibi fidet, / dux reget examen*).[66] Callimachus

[64] In Aristophanes' *Frogs* Dionysus travels to Hades to fetch Euripides, because Athens has run out of good tragic poets. Dionysus instead has to return with Aeschylus, who in a trial before Pluto proved himself the better dramatist. The return of Hipponax from Hades, inasmuch as it recalls the premise of the *Frogs*, adds comic overtones to Callimachus. Where have the good iambists gone? When you think you have Hipponax, you end up with Callimachus.

[65] Speaking through a resurrected Hipponax does not preclude Callimachean originality; cf. Scodel, 1987: 213.

[66] Without the direct reference to Callimachus, Horace's *examen* ("swarm") is difficult; cf. Barchiesi, 2001: 150.

resurrected a powerful Hipponax, prepared to match wits against the most learned in society. Likewise, Horace, through the act of disavowing certain aspects of Archilochean iambic, gives Archilochus new life and potency. By applying Callimachus' reintroduction of Hipponax to Archilochus, Horace is making an iambic response to Callimachus. Callimachus is returning to qualities found in archaic iambic, Callimachus back to Hipponax. Horace can do better. He can push beyond Callimachus/Hipponax and take iambic back to its foremost artist: Horace to Callimachus to Hipponax to Archilochus (… *Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio*, *Epist.* I.19.23–24a).

Callimachus' and Horace's remodeling of Hipponax and Archilochus rely on the diversity within the iambic tradition. In its migration between ritual and literary contexts, iambic became a complex medium with the potential to alienate and/or facilitate understanding. The *telos* of archaic iambic varied, pinned between opposing motivations and perspectives. The plot-lines of Horace's *Epodes* build off these tensions (for example, epodes 1, 6, 12, and 17). Friendship has its rewards and dangers. Maecenas gave a lovely estate to Horace and sailed off to war for Octavian, both because of friendship; Horace pledges to follow, but says the farm Maecenas gave him was more than enough (epode 1). Was Archilochus "too iambic" (ἰαμβικώτερο[ν, *SEG* 15.517, A[E_1] col. 3) or was the vehemence of his attack proportional to how the Lykambids had wronged him (ἓν δ' ἐπίσταμαι μέγα / τὸν κακῶς ⟨μ'⟩ ἔρδοντα δεινοῖς ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς., Archil. fr. 126W)? Likewise, the Horatian iambist objects when the innocent are attacked (epode 6). He protests, however, by launching a counter-assault against the offending iambist with the vehemence of Archilochus against the Lykambids and Hipponax against Bupalus (6.11–14). Horace, the iambist, cannot satisfy a woman and to defend himself he aims at her one of his most notorious iambic verses: "What would satisfy you, a woman who really needs a big black elephant cock?" (*Quid tibi vis, mulier nigris dignissima barris?*, epode 12.1). The male iambist anticipates that his mockery will shame and silence the woman, but to the iambist's disgust she answers back (*vel mea cum saevis agitat fastidia verbis*, 12.13). Then, she is surprised when her iambic reply runs him off ('*o ego non felix, quam tu fugis ut pavet acris / agna lupos capreaeque leones!*', 12.25–26). The two iambists, male and female, are caught off guard when their iambic achieves an effect contrary to their expectations. Horace assigns the most violent and angry side of iambic to a woman, a witch Canidia, whom he dismissed with a fart and a laugh in his *Satires* (I.8); but, he ends the *Epodes* by engaging that witch in an iambic duet, dancing between

feigned contrition and the desire for domination and annihilation (epode 17). Such tensions become a driving force in Horatian iambic. And the extent to which Horace succeeds in forming such oppositions into a unified song supports his claim to have brought the whole of iambic to Rome. He can have Callimachus' Hipponax and lessons on mutuality, while he maintains iambic's Archilochean potency.

Second, whatever Horace's characterization of iambic may have been, should the designation "iambic" be applied to his later literary criticism, since it is so distant from the *Epodes*? The question occurs because Horace frames his *Ars Poetica* with invectives against a bad painter and mad poet, which imagines again for Rome the iambic exchange between Bupalus (bad artist) and Hipponax (mad poet). The start and stop of Horace's *Ars* suggests that Hipponax, when he abused the sculptors Bupalus (fr. 12; 15), Athenis (fr. 70), and the painter Mimnes (fr. 28 W), was not just waging a private vendetta, even if in the case of the sculptors he was the subject of their art (*Suda* 2.665.16; Plin. *H.N.* 36.11–12).[67] A bad singer or artist has *kosmic* consequences, because their failure promotes division (artist from audience; audience members from each other, Chapter 6). This dissolution of society is a public disaster. Iambic, therefore, places a high value on the aesthetic. For an iambic poet to undertake literary criticism would be natural, and that criticism might well include blame.

Third, how does any critic approach iambic? Admittedly, I am unable to keep my distance:

> Vigorous invective or mockery may elicit in some audiences a nervous laughter, while others are driven to repudiation and even censorship, but any audience confronted by such poetry must at some point come to terms with the satirist's persistent desire to drag them into his (occasionally her) orbit, even when they would prefer to keep their distance.
>
> (R. Rosen, 2007: x–xi)

To replicate this dynamic I am choosing in writing *Iambic Criticism* to conflate my private and public voice as a critic. Iambic can sustain narrative, but it is not a third person mode.[68] An iambist and iambic characters speak to someone, for and/or against someone, with someone. Performing, therefore, makes the iambist vulnerable even when

[67] See Acosta-Hughes (2002: 32–35) for Hipponax's attacks on the artists as an "aesthetic criticism." Cf. Callimachus on the statue of Zeus at Olympia by Phidias (*Iamb.* 6); Apollo's gift of song (*Iamb.* 12); literary criticism (*Iamb.* 13); the Telchines, *Aet.* fr. 1 Pf.

[68] Miller, 1994: 13–14; Mankin, 1995: 9; Bowie, 2001: 1–27; Carey, 2009: 151.

communicating common/communal experiences. The iambist expresses emotions, laughter, anger, and fear; admits to being wronged or committing wrong; curses; loves and rejects; all the while presenting and often testing how society functions, which makes iambic compelling and potentially annoying. Along the way, my own iambic criticism may belittle Horace's (sorry), irritate my reader, and will end by mocking me ("An Iambic Post-Lude"). In other words, my style and mode of expression are meant to emulate, if only in a derivative manner, Horace's iambic praxis.

CHAPTER ONE

NON RES ET AGENTIA VERBA LYCAMBEN: ON NOT HUNTING DOWN LYKAMBES

ἐπεὶ δ’ ἔπαυσ’ εἰλαπίνας
θεοῖς βροτείῳ τε γένει,
Ζεὺς μειλίσσων στυγίους
Ματρὸς ὀργὰς ἐνέπει·
Βᾶτε, σεμναὶ Χάριτες,
ἴτε, τᾷ περὶ παρθένῳ
Δηοῖ θυμωσαμένᾳ
λύπαν ἐξαλλάξατ’ ἀλαλᾷ
Μοῦσαί θ’ ὕμνοισι χορῶν.
χαλκοῦ δ’ αὐδὰν χθονίαν
τύπανά τ’ ἔλαβε βυρσοτενῆ
καλλίστα τότε πρῶτα μακά-
ρων Κύπρις· γέλασέν τε θεὰ
δέξατό τ’ ἐς χέρας
βαρύβρομον αὐλὸν
τερφθεῖσ’ ἀλαλαγμῷ. (Eur. *Helen* 1337–1352)

But, since she had brought to an end the festivities of gods and mortals alike, Zeus, in his effort to soothe the hellish anger of the Mother, said, “Go, holy Graces, go drive out the pain of Demeter’s resentment over her maiden daughter with the shrill cry; and you, Muses, with song and dance.” Then the earth-sprung noise of the bronze and the skin-stretched drums were taken up for the first time by her who is fairest of the Blessed, Cyprian Aphrodite. And the goddess Demeter burst into laughter and took into her hand the deep echoing flute, delighting in its keening.[1]

Quando repostum Caecubum ad festas dapes
  victore laetus Caesare
tecum sub alta (sic Iovi gratum) domo,
  beate Maecenas, bibam
sonante mixtum tibiis carmen lyra,
  hac Dorium, illis barbarum (epode 9.1–6)

---

[1] Over the years I have enjoyed discussing with J.K. Newman the question of ritual laughter in the origins of the iambic genre. See, in particular, his “The Ἰαμβικὴ Ἰδέα” (1990: 43–74). The above translation (1998: 103–104) is his along with my gratitude and respect.

> When will I, delighting in Caesar's victory, blessed Maecenas, drink with you at your grand home the Caecuban reserved for festal feasts—so it is pleasing to Jove—while the lyre and flute, sounding together, combine their Dorian and Phrygian song?

Disavowing Iambic: The Negative and Positive

When Robert W. Carrubba published his work on the arrangement of the *Epodes* (1969), he noted that these 627 verses had been neglected. There was no critical work in English devoted to the *Epodes*, and the last German and French works dated to the turn of the century (1904 and 1917 respectively).[2] As the tumultuous sixties gave way to the freedom of the seventies, interest in the *Epodes* grew steadily until, with the turn to a new millennium, "neglect" was a memory: A. Cávarzere's edition (1992); D. Mankin's commentary (1995); a collection on Greek and Latin iambic poetry from a conference at the University of Torino, *Iambic Ideas* (2001); studies by D.L. Clayman (1980: 72–83), J. Henderson (1987; 1999), W. Fitzgerald (1988), E.A. Schmidt (1990), E. Olienis (1998: 64–101), A. Barchiesi (2001; 2002; 2009), and A. Cucchiarelli (2001); a series of articles by L.C. Watson (1983; 1987; 1995; 2007), and Watson's comprehensive Oxford commentary (2003; over 600 pages or almost one page for every verse).[3] This renewed attention highlights that one of the most basic questions raised about the *Epodes* still holds. What work does Horatian iambic do, especially within its social context of the civil war environment of the thirties BC? The answer is complicated because it is part of a literary interest in how Horace comprehends the nature of iambic from his Greek predecessors and so defines his iambic in relation to theirs. Should Horace's iambic praxis be read as milder than Archilochean and Hipponactean invective, or does it find a way to maintain the vigor of archaic iambic?

---

[2] Carrubba (1969: "Preface") refers to Plüss (1904) and Olivier (1917).

[3] These authors, who influence my reading of the iambic Horace, illustrate the escalating interest in iambic and specifically Horace's *Epodes* at the turn of the century. Our work on the *Epodes* reflects, as is often the case with interpretive trends, contemporary social concerns: interest gaining ground with the social revolutions of the 60s, increasing through the more open cultural attitudes of the 70's and 80's, and then peaking with concern over political and social stability in the present transition from the 20th to 21st century. The work on iambic continues full speed; note, for example, Rotstein (2010). On anger, invective, and restraint in Greece and Rome, ranging beyond iambic poetry and Horace's *Epodes*, see in particular Harris (2001); Kaster (2005); Rosen (2007); Halliwell (2008); Worman (2008). I cite Horace from S.B.'s edition, judging it the most critical.

The answer to such questions looks past the *Epodes* to *Epistle* I.19.19–34 and *Ars Poetica* 79–82 where Horace defends the originality and superiority of his iambic poetry, and comments on the utility of the iambic meter:

> O imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe
> bilem, saepe iocum vestri movere tumultus!
> libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps,
> non aliena meo pressi pede. qui sibi fidet,
> dux reget examen. Parios ego primus iambos
> ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus
> Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben.
> ac ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes
> quod timui mutare modos et carminis artem,
> temperat Archilochi Musam pede mascula Sappho,
> temperat Alcaeus, sed rebus et ordine dispar,
> nec socerum quaerit quem versibus oblinat atris,
> nec sponsae laqueum famoso carmine nectit.
> hunc quoque, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus
> vulgavi fidicen. iuvat immemorata ferentem
> ingenuis oculisque legi manibusque teneri. (*Epist.* I.19.19–34)

> Copy-cats, servile beast-pack, how often your clamor raised my bile, how often it provoked my jeer! I was the first to step freely into wide open territory and I walked where no one set foot before. A self-confident leader will rule the swarm. I was the first to show Parian iambs to Latium, following Archilochus' meter and vitality, not his content and words hunting down Lykambes. And lest you adorn me with too meager a wreath, because I was afraid to change the measures and art of his song, Sappho, a woman among men, modulates her Muse to Archilochean beat; Alcaeus too, but distinct in content and arrangement. Alcaeus does not look for a father-in-law to smear with black verse, and for his bride he does not weave a noose out of notorious song. Alcaeus also, completely unfamiliar before, I, Latium's lyricist, made a household name. I, relating what is new, love to be read and handled by eyes and hands of the free-born.

> Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo;
> hunc socci cepere pedem grandesque cothurni
> alternis aptum sermonibus et popularis
> vincentem strepitus et natum rebus agendis. (*Ars* 79–82)

> Rage armed Archilochus with the iamb, the appropriate meter. Comedy and tragedy adopted this meter fit as it was for dialogue and for rising above the noise of an audience, and born for action.

The final verdict on Horace's iambic temperament is hampered by both the circumstances and nature of the evidence. When Horace describes his

iambic achievement, he does so ten to eleven years after the publication of the *Epodes* within an entirely different context and genre. His iambic criticism, therefore, must be interpreted with some regard to his later poetry. It would be one-dimensional to read his description of his iambic praxis back into the *Epodes* as if changes in time and circumstances were not in play. Horace does not just use epistle 19 to shape his iambic legacy, he also uses his iambic reputation from the *Epodes* to add nerve to the argument of epistle 19 and to communicate his absolute disgust at poets whose work is derivative. His iambic commentary looks both to the past and present. Add in that even though Horace specifically names some of his models—Archilochus, Sappho, and Alcaeus—the fragmentary nature of these sources is challenging. We know neither the full extent of these predecessors' themes nor the arrangement of their poetry books. Since we are hindered by these blinders, as when Horace says that Alcaeus differed from Archilochus in content and arrangement (*sed rebus et ordine dispar*, 29), one hesitates to give precise details and denote any exact degrees of difference.

All the same cautious generalities prove instructive. Horace lays claim to iambic originality based on chronological priority, being the first to bring Parian iambs to Latium (*Parios ego primus iambos / ostendi Latio*, 23), and on priority as supremacy.[4] The emphatic promotion of *Parios* before *ego primus* shows Horace giving special place to Archilochus, the originator of the genre, and to himself as its foremost Roman practitioner. Horace emboldens his status as the Roman iambic poet with political overtones: he is the "prince" of iambs (*princeps*, 21). Augustus' consolidation of power through the constitutional settlements (27 and 23 BC) had established *princeps* as a title admitting no rival. Horace ended his lyric *tribiblos*, *Odes* I–III, with the same triumphant boast:

. . . dum Capitolium
scandet cum tacita virgine pontifex
dicar, qua violens obstrepit Aufidus
et qua pauper aquae Daunus agrestium
regnavit populorum, ex humili potens

princeps Aeolium carmen ad Italos
deduxisse modos. (*C.* III.30.8–14a)

[4] Lucilius and Catullus had already written iambic (*Iambus est carmen maledicum plerumque trimetro versu et epodo sequente conpositum . . . apellatum est autem* παρὰ τὸ ἰαμβίζειν, *quod est maledicere. cuius carminis praecipui scriptores apud Graecos Archilochus et Hipponax, apud Romanos Lucilius et Catullus et Horatius et Bibaculus.*, Diomedes, *Ars Gramm.* Keil I.485.11–17).

> … As long as the high priest with the silent vestal ascends the Capitoline, I, where the whirling Aufidus roars and where Daunus in a dry land ruled over his country people, from a humble beginning I will be named the prince, powerful in bringing Aeolian song into Italian verse.

The humble singer from the land of King Daunus became the lyric prince, and he would stay preeminent so as long as Rome's high priest ascended the Capitoline. Horace's repeated regal language (*princeps* and *regnavit / reget*, epist. 19.21–22; c.30.12–13) invests the *Epodes* with his lyric immortality, more lasting and loftier than the Egyptian pyramids (… *perennius / regalique situ pyramidum altius*, c.30.1–2). Horace does not recognize any disparity in his iambic and lyric achievement: he admits no Roman equal, nor even a challenger, in either.[5]

Clearly Horace, when facing the criticism that his iambics lack originality, does not adopt a mild, deferential attitude. He has iambic pride. He does not copy his models; he *emulates* them, including both Callimachus (21–23) and Archilochus (24–31). Although Horace does not name Callimachus among his iambic models, he adapts the Lycian vision of Callimachus' *Aetia* and embellishes it to assert his own independence within the iambic tradition, even from Callimachus.[6] Apollo instructs Callimachus to follow a trackless and narrow path (*Aetia* I. fr. 1.27b–28

---

[5] Horace defines his iambic enterprise with echoes of his lyric persona and achievement (epist. 19.21–26: *libera*, *vacuum* [beyond constraint, cf. *cantamus, vacui*, *C.* I.6.19]; *dux reget examen* [bee-like industriousness and concise precision, cf. *ego apis Matinae / more … operosa parvus / carmina fingo*, *C.* IV.2.27a–32]; *ac ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes* [coronation and nobility, cf. *Me doctarum hederae praemia frontium / dis miscent superis*, *C.* I.1.29–30a; *fingent Aeolio carmine nobilem*, *C.* IV.3.12.]). Also note Horace's play between Alcaeus and Archilochus: *temperat Archilochi Musam … temperat Alcaeus … nec sponsae laqueum famoso carmine nectit. / hunc quoque, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus / vulgavi fidicen* (epist. 19.28–33a). Because Horace just spoke of being the first to bring Parian iambic to Rome and just mentioned Archilochus' attack on the Lykambids in most graphic images (vv.30–31), the audience is prepared to take "this one" *hunc* (v.32) as Archilochus. When the verse reads out, "this one" becomes Alcaeus. The slippage, in spite of the negatives *nec … nec* that distance Alcaeus from Archilochus (vv.30–31), connects Horace's iambic with his lyric achievement. "This one" [Archilochus—Alcaeus] is not a muddled transition. Horace uses a transition from his *Epodes* to *Odes* to modulate the "supposed" essence of iambi (retaliatory rage) with communal/group dynamics. This move by Horace shifts iambic from the simplistic paradigm "I against you," too readily taken as the fundamental nature of invective-attacks, to a more comprehensive view that acknowledges in iambic the capacity to bring together.

[6] Likewise Horace distinguishes his satire from Lucilius and Callimachus in *S.* I.10; see Scodel (1987: 199, 213–215).

Pf.: κελεύθους / ἀτρίπτο]υ̣ϲ, εἰ καὶ ϲτεινοτέρην ἐλάϲειϲ), whereas Horace treads down a way (*posui* ... *pressi*, 21–22) which is completely free, unoccupied (*libera per vacuum* ... *vestigia*, 21), and where no other has ever set foot (*aliena*, 22). Also, this Callimachean imagery does not mollify his Archilochean mood.[7] Horace is perfectly willing to identify with Archilochus' *animus* (*numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi*, 24–25a). Horace blames and calls names. The poets who try to imitate him are dumb cattle with no will of their own (*servum pecus*). They are mimes, nothing but mere practitioners of *imitatio*, who cannot raise their own art to the level of *aemulatio*. Their discordant uproar (*tumultus*), as they war among themselves to follow one artistic fad after another, rouses Horace's bile and invites his ridicule (*saepe / bilem*, *saepe iocum*, *Epist.* I.19.19b–20a)—a most iambic mood (cf. *S.* I.9.65–66; epode 11.15–18; *C.* I.13.1–8).

Horace's defense of his *Epodes*, his angry attack on his poetic mimes and strong claim to iambic originality, calls to question attempts to read the *Epodes* as an expression of iambic weakness or as a Callimachean mollification of Archilochean invective. Horace's look back at his *Epodes* asserts too much iambic power. This claim may at first seem paradoxical, since in several epodes Horace tempts his audience to view him as a weak iambist. These instances, however, do not amount to serious

---

[7] It is popular to view Horace's *Epodes* as an exposé on the weakness of iambic or the iambist (see discussions by Fraenkel, 1957: 35–36; Fitzgerald, 1988: 176–177, 189; Mayer, 1994: 263–265; Kerkhecker, 1999: 275–276; Watson, 1995: 201–202 [with caveats and a guarded conclusion] and 2003: 12; compare Newman, 1998: 120 ["mealy-mouthed" except against women]; Feeney, 2002: 172, 182). Our tendency to push this line of argument too far and tame Horatian iambics stems in part from identifying Horace with a stereotyped Callimachean iambic; see Barchiesi (2002: 55): "Callimachus (in what has become a commonplace for Latinists) distances himself from the cruel aggressiveness of the archaic iamb; instead, he offers a civilized, moderated, artistic version that the Romans will be able to make their own. The bases for this interpretation seem to me to be equivocal." Compare Rosen's assessment of Callimachean iambic from *Iambus* 1 (2007: 187; cf. 188 n.27): "His (Hipponax's) return to the underworld (in *Iambus* 1) allows Callimachus from that point on in the collection to work in this genre independently of his predecessors, but always implicated in the tradition that they had established. Callimachus may indeed feel that his iambus will be a newer, more contemporary form than its Hipponactean ancestor, but it hardly seems the case that he located this novelty in a repudiation of satiric vituperation and a conscious move toward a milder form of satire. Callimachus himself must have surely realized that a "gentle iambus" would have been something of a contradiction in terms." Horace's Callimachean title for epode 1, *Ibis*, plays the trick of Hipponax's "return to the underworld" (*Iambus* 1) back on Callimachus. Horace simultaneously gives credit to Callimachus as predecessor, while he causes Callimachus' iambic to journey off into a Roman context ("You will go").

confessions of iambic impotence. Horace's contrived surrender to Canidia (epode 17) is strong enough to provoke her intensified rage. More often Horace puts doubts about his iambic power into the mouths of others, patrons (epode 1, 14) and enraged lovers (epode 8, 12), and then defends himself against those doubts, at times placing the charges that he is weak within the context of his most potent attacks.[8] In this way he creates an introspective iambist ('Can I live up to the expectations of my audience or not?'), who calls attention to his claim that his iambic will prove its worth. Further, the either-or-debate between the "temperate" Callimachus and the "attacking" Archilochus insists on judging Horace's iambs only through the lens of one or the other of his models, themselves taken to be diametrically opposed. This rigid bifurcation risks underestimating his iambic, which Horace warned against doing (*ac ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes*, "and lest you adorn me with too meager a wreath," *Epist.* I.19.26). It is hardly possible to so limit Horace's predecessors or even his audience. *Ne … ornes* ("lest you adorn" [singular]) is not directed at the slavish imitators, nor Horace's fans and emulators, but Maecenas, to whom the whole poem is addressed. That said, Horace stands Maecenas in the place of a generic critic, whose opinion Horace intimates may reflect that of a wider critical audience. It is also possible that the "critic/s" are nothing more than "straw men," invented by Horace to give him a chance to define his own legacy and turn the tables on the expectations of the slavish imitators by putting himself, the iambist, on the receiving end of the criticism, which Callimachus does with the critics' attacks against him in *Iambus* 13. To decorate Horace's iambics with too meager a crown implies dividing his iambic art into more

---

[8] Compare Fitzgerald, 1988: 176: "Archilochus projected confidence in the efficacy of his poetry (126W), whether it was used to exhort his fellow citizens (3W) or to avenge himself on his enemies (*Epode* 6.11–14); poetry for him was power. Horace's attitude to his calling is much less secure, he is not so much concerned with striking a pose as with questioning this pose …"; n.b. that Horace is cited to confirm Archilochus' potency. Again we may be turning Horace into too reticent an iambist. His affirmation of his own iambic (*Epist.* I.19), the thematic movements within the *Epodes* (Chapters 2–3), and the careful transition from the *Epodes* to the *Odes* (Chapters 4–5) indicate that Horace's iambic posture is closer to "Archilochus' projected confidence" than a "questioning." Fitzgerald deserves credit for pointing out how Horace's strong claims about his manhood (e.g., epode 15.11–16) deflect in some way the attacks on his iambic potency in other epodes. Fitzgerald marks a significant advancement in the discussion on Horace's iambic persona, because he provides justification for not dividing the political from the erotic. Likewise, Horace in his *Odes* and later panegyrics (*Odes* IV) does not divide the erotic from the political, the public from private (Johnson, 2004b).

comfortable and neat categories—such as, the attacker and the attacked—than Horace's explanation of his iambic praxis allows. His iambic will be more than what is expected.[9]

Horace's evaluation of the iambic enterprise requires a balancing act between the negative and positive.[10] Caught in a moment of anger, he refuses to identify himself with "Archilochus" (*non res et agentia verba Lycamben*, epist. 19.25b).[11] He does not practice the iambic art without modification and a good portion of his iambic genius lies in disavowal, which in itself is an act of power. Within the context of epistle 19, Horace works to distinguish his iambics from other contemporary poetry, which because of its slavish imitation lacks nerve. It is logical to assume then that he is arguing that his iambs contain a creative bite all their own. He does expose in his *Epodes* the destructive nature of retaliatory rage, iambic as vendetta. Yet, just as much as he disavows a particular aspect of Archilochean iambic, he affirms Archilochus as a model (*numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi*, 19.24b–25a). Horace is not outlawing Archilochus as much as he is preserving for Rome what the essence of Archilochean iambic should be.[12] Conversely, therefore, his disavowal would likely not be a complete reversal of the iambic genre into a un-Archilochean, docile mode. Accordingly the phrase, "rage armed Archilochus with the appropriate meter" (*Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo*, *Ars* 79) does not need to be read as a negative indictment of the Archilochean temperament; rather, it epitomizes iambic as Horace exercises it against the slavish poets in epistle 19. Their uproar (*tumultus*)

[9] Call. *Iamb* 13 is a prominent intertext for *S.* I.10 where Horace asserts his poetic independence from his literary predecessors (Scodel, 1987: 199–215). On whether Callimachus' critics were actual or fictional, see Clayman (1980: 44–47); Scodel (1987: 206, n.13); Acosta-Hughes (2002: 74–76).

[10] Compare the positive and negative in Muretus' disavowal, when he uses Lykambid language to reject the Lykambid mentality. He calls for a rage (*rabies*) that can bring renewal: *rumpe Lycambea numeros de caede madentes, / Musa ferox, rabieque nova flammata malignos / fige hominum mores damnataque saecula culpae* (*satyra* 2.1–3).

[11] I place "Archilochus" in quotes (and would continue to do so if it were not so annoying) to indicate that in epistle 19 Horace must work to differentiate himself from the popular perception of "Archilochus." Horace does not have free reign over his model, that is, Archilochean iambic raises expectations and prejudices that Horace may or may not find accurate. Therefore, his disavowal tells us as much about the prevalent attitude about iambic as his own—perhaps more.

[12] *Numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi, non res* (*Epist.* I.19.24–25a): "spirit" (*animos*) would be the vitality within Archilochean poetry that cannot be defined merely by meter (*numeros*) and content (*res*); see Lowrie (2009b: 254).

moves Horace to outrage (*bilem*) and jests (*saepe iocum*), and so he responds with an iambic temperament (*animos … Archilochi*). If we read Horace's characterization of iambic in the *Ars Poetica* against his own temper in the epistle with an eye on social interactions and not just metrics, Horace's reaction against his imitators becomes predictable, because rage uses iambic, a mode suited for overcoming such crowd noise (*popularis / vincentem strepitus*, *Ars* 81b–82a) and taking action (*et natum rebus agendis*, *Ars* 82b).

Horace's vigorous defense of his iambic creativity suggests that he is affirming the potency of iambic and at the same time rejecting a stereotypical view of the genre. According to his own analysis, the *Epodes* gains its energy by adopting Archilochus in a manner that resists a pedestrian and restricted view of Parian iambic. Whatever gaps remain in our knowledge of *iambos*, Horace's iambic criticism, therefore, at least gives us the opportunity to investigate how iambic was conceptualized and read.[13] In other words, hiding behind Horace's defense of his *Epodes* in *Epistle* I.19 is a dangerous reality for any poet aiming to be original. Horace prefers to state the matter positively:

> iuvat immemorata ferentem
> ingenuis oculisque legi manibusque teneri. (33b–34)
>
> I, relating what is new, love to be read and handled by eyes and hands of the free-born.

I will be negative: Horace prefers that the "servile herd" (*servum pecus*) stay away from his poetry. Most eyes and hands require art to conform to their own limited expectations, and an artist is left trying to push beyond these without at worst being outright rejected and at best being misunderstood.[14] In this case, what type of iambic would slavish imitators sign off on as "Archilochean"?

---

13 Brown (1997: 42) ends his introduction to *iambos* with this final note (no. 108): "… it remains uncertain what precisely would constitute ἴαμβος, as Archilochus would have understood the genre." Horace's defense of his own iambic with regard to his model Archilochus is perhaps our best guide on the question.

14 Oliensis (1998: 174) and Feeney (2009: 31) point out that there is a difference between Horace's wish and his fate. He may prefer an elite literary audience, but he knows there is no keeping anyone's hands off his verse (*Epist.* I.20: *contrectatus ubi manibus sordescere vulgi / coeperis*, 11–12a). Immortality comes at the price of popularity.

Archilochus and the Lykambid Tradition

The witnesses to Archilochus' life and song brand him the maestro of destructive speech, a judgment rendered centuries before Horace and that persisted long after. More than any other, the account of Lykambes and his daughters symbolizes the enraged verbal violence of Archilochean iambic toward its targets.[15] The witnesses attest that Archilochus attacked the Lykambids with sexual ridicule so vicious that they hung themselves rather than live with the infamy.[16] Many say that Archilochus launched his iambic attack after Lykambes broke an oath to give one of his daughters, Neobule, to Archilochus in marriage. More, however, do not bother with any circumstances. They simply reference the name of Lykambes, as if it were the definitive tag for Archilochean iambic. Some for added metaphoric punch throw in "blood,"[17] no matter that death by hanging is a bloodless suicide, or in a most sympathetic manner have the daughters protest their innocence from the grave:[18]

> Οὐ μὰ τόδε φθιμένων σέβας ὅρκιον αἵδε Λυκάμβεω,
> αἳ λάχομεν στυγερὴν κληδόνα, θυγατέρες
> οὔτε τι παρθενίην ᾐσχύναμεν, οὔτε τοκῆας
> οὔτε Πάρον, νήσων αἰπυτάτην ἱερῶν,
> ἀλλὰ καθ' ἡμετέρης γενεῆς ῥιγηλὸν ὄνειδος
> φήμην τε στυγερὴν ἔφλυσεν Ἀρχίλοχος.
> (Diosc. *A.P.* 7.351; Gerber, test. 20)

> We swear by this tomb an oath sacred for the dead, that we, Lykambes' daughters, who were given a loathsome reputation, did not in any way dishonor our virginity, nor our parents, nor Paros, most illustrious of holy isles; but against our family Archilochus spouted his bone-chilling reproach and loathsome rumor.

[15] Tarditi (1968) and Chaniotis (1988) review the *testimonia* in full; Gerber's Loeb (1999) conveniently covers the major witnesses (see also his bibliography, 1991). Horace predates much of the *testimonia*, but the story of Archilochus against the Lykambids and their suicide must have been well known among the *litterati* of epistle 19. Horace's reference indicates that he anticipated that this particular story would color his readers' perception of iambic. Or, if Horace is especially sly, he would have us believe that the critics were so simple as to construct their entire appreciation of a genre around this one episode. Horace is fortunate (and skillful enough) to control the characterization of the imitators and influence how we perceive them.

[16] Testt. 19–32 (Gerber, 1999); Archilochus against the Lykambids exists now only in tantalizing and disputed fragments (30–82, 189, 206; Lykambes, frr. 33, 38, 54, 60 [?], 172, 173; Neobule, frr. 118, 119, 188 [?], 196 W).

[17] Archilochus has blood on his hands, although he used words not weapons to do his killing (cf. Ov. *Ibis* 53–54, 521–524; Mart.7.12.6; Gaet. *A.P.* 7.71).

[18] Also Mel. ([?] W) *A.P.* 7.352 = *HE* 4742–4749.

> prima quidem coepto committam proelia versu,
> non soleant quamvis hoc pede bella geri.
>
> postmodo, si perges, in te mihi liber iambus
> tincta Lycambeo sanguine tela dabit.
> nunc, quo Battiades inimicum devovet Ibin,
> hoc ego devoveo teque tuosque modo. (Ov. *Ibis* 43–44, 51–54)
>
> For our first fight I will stick with the verse I started with, although it is not customary to wage war to this beat.
>
> Later, if you persist, my free iambic will launch against you its barbs wet with Lykambes' blood. For now, just as Battiades cursed his enemy Ibis, so I will curse you and your household.

Ovid is cursing his enemy now with Callimachean-styled elegy, but if his foe persists, he threatens to launch a worse weapon, the bloody missiles of Archilochean iambic.[19] Archilochus and his iambics are enough to frighten even Cerberus, the guardian hound of hell, who had seen the boat that brought Lykambes' daughters to his world below (Jul. Aegypt. *A.P.* 7.69). Likewise, the Spartans, afraid for their children's moral development, banned Archilochean poetry for its lewdness, and because with it he had destroyed the house he despised (Val. Max. 6.3, ext. 1).[20] Martial objects to someone writing Archilochean invective under his name, as if this would discredit and demean the quality of his own epigrams. Martial can make his brand of blame appear safer and more amusing by disowning the spurious Archilochean imitations:

[19] Lucian (*Pseudol.* 2) may wish that he could match Archilochus' abusive vehemence to use against his own enemy, but claims he is no Archilochus (Ταῦτά σοι καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπειλῶ, οὐ μὰ τὸν Δία τῷ Ἀρχιλόχῳ εἰκάζων ἐμαυτὸν—πόθεν; πολλοῦ γε καὶ δέω). Lucian's opponent has committed so many wrongs that even Archilochus would need the help of Hipponax and Semonides to pay him back in kind. This is a comparison based in ethics, which allows Lucian to distance himself from the meanest of iambic by portraying his critic as the lowest of all enemies. The entire lampoon, like Ovid's, depends on Archilochus being the champion of vindictive iambic.

[20] If the stern and martial Spartans took their Archilochus seriously they would have another reason for banishing his poetry, for Plutarch (*Instit. Lac.* 34.239b) says that they exiled the poet on account of his cowardly brag that he could care less that he ran from battle and left his shield in the bushes (fr. 5 W). Valerius' exemplum ignores the precedent set by the Spartans and names Archilochus the best or next to best poet (*itaque maximum poetam aut certe summo proximum*) to support the assertion that Roman moral standards do not necessarily discount artistic genius (*ceterum etsi Romana severitatis exemplis totus terrarum orbis instrui potest, tamen externa summatim cognosse fastidio non sit.*).

Sic me fronte legat dominus, Faustine, serena
    excipiatque meos, qua solet aure, iocos,
ut mea nec, iuste quos odit, pagina laesit,
    et mihi de nullo fama rubore placet.
Quid prodest, cupiant cum quidam nostra videri,
    si qua Lycambeo sanguine tela madent,
vipereumque vomat nostro sub nomine virus,
    qui Phoebi radios ferre diemque negat?
ludimus innocui: scis hoc bene: iuro potentis
    per genium Famae Castaliumque gregem
perque tuas aures, magni mihi numinis instar,
    lector inhumana liber ab invidia. (Mart. 7.12)

So may my master, Faustinus, read me with no worries and welcome with his usual favor my jests, since my page has never hurt even those it has a right to despise, and I do not want to win my fame off of anyone's blush. But what good does this do me, when some are keen to pass off as mine any weapon at all wet with Lykambes' blood, and someone, who refuses to endure Phoebus' rays and daylight, vomits vipery venom under my name? My game is harmless. You know it well. I swear this, by the genius of mighty Fame and the Castalian band and your ears, to you my reader free from cold-blooded envy and in my eyes a mighty will divine.

Martial's insistence that his jests are safe can only be convincing on the presupposition that Archilochean invective is all about blame and pain.

All sensationalism aside—ἴαμβος was the mode for assault and Archilochus its most skilled and notorious practitioner:

ἓν δ' ἐπίσταμαι μέγα,
τὸν κακῶς ⟨μ'⟩ ἔρδοντα δεινοῖς ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς.
(Archil. fr. 126 W)

I am well versed in one mighty way: to pay back with horrific injury anyone who hurts me.

Ἀρχιλόχου τάδε μέτρα καὶ ἠχήεντες ἴαμβοι,
    θυμοῦ καὶ φοβερῆς ἰὸς ἐπεσβολίης. (Anon. *A.P.* 9.185)

Such are Archilochus' verses and sounding iambs, rage's poison and fright-filled scurrility.

summa in hoc vis elocutionis, cum validae tum breves vibrantesque sententiae, plurimum sanguinis atque nervorum, adeo ut videatur quibusdam quod quoquam minor est, materiae esse non ingenii vitium.
(Quint. 10.1.60)

> He expresses himself with the greatest force, speech not just powerful but concise and vibrant, full of blood and muscle, so that if he seems to some second-rate, it is a flaw in his content not his ability.

The deadly attack on the Lykambids is so pervasive in Archilochean reception that it is encoded into descriptions of his style: Archilochean iambs are poison (ἰὸς); his speech quivers and is full of blood (*vibrantesque sententiae, plurimum sanguinis*). It does not matter that the name "Lykambes" has the look of a convenient generic pseudonym (λύκ(ος) ["wolf"]-(ἴ)αμβ-), which in our modern era raises questions about the authenticity of the story and its details.[21] It makes little difference whether or not the story can be verified or is exaggerated. Since the incident supports the natural supposition that insult leads to injury, in this case that rage in verse kills, Lykambes and his dead daughters are easy to accept as iambic reality. The dramatic, particularly when logical, persuades.

The *testimonia*, as consistent as it is, constitutes "hearsay" when it comes to clarifying the expectations about Archilochean iambic that Horace would have to confront. Catullus is more a first-hand witness. He is Horace's near contemporary with a leading iambic voice, and he reinforces the presupposition that Archilochean iambic represents invective intended to defame and injure. Catullus never names Archilochus. He does not need to: his iambics embrace blame.[22] Catullus with his iambics attacks the corrupt politicians Nonius and P. Vatinius (c.52). He scolds Thallus for being soft (c.25) and censures Pompey's and Caesar's "prick"

---

[21] Lykambes is a combination of "wolf" and "step," "wolf-walker" (Pickard-Cambridge, 1927:15), a referent at present debated: perhaps a dance-step performed in iambic ritual contexts (Nagy, 1979: 242) or a symbol for the perjurer, "one who steps on the oath" (Gagnè, 2009: 264; cf. Hawkins, 2008: 93–114; Rotstein, 2010: 116–124). All agree, as Gagnè remarks, "Lyk-ambes was linked somehow to i-ambos in popular folk etymology." The name also may hold religious significance. The wolf is a complex ritual marker: for instance, the lone wolf symbolizing the exile, the scapegoat or initiate who must live apart from the community; the werewolf depicting transformation through ritual slaughter (Gernet, 1968: 132–133; Burkert, 1972: 83–134; Ogden, 1997: 42; Compton, 2006: 111, on Alc. 130b W). A good starting point on the question of Lykambes "fact or fiction" is Brown, 1997: 50–69; cf. West, 1974: 26–28; Carey, 1986: 60–67; Slings, 1990: 23–26. For further bibliography and how the etymology of the name Lykambes relates to epode 4, see *infra*, Chapter 2.

[22] Catullus' straight iambics are: trimeter (c. 4, 29, 52), tetrameter (c.25); Hipponax's limping iambic (8, 22, 31, 37, 39, 44, 59, 60). The phalaeceans (hendecasyllables) add over forty. C.52 is most Archilochean because Catullus allows spondees in the first and third iamb.

of a staff member, Mamurra (c.29; cf. *mentula*, c. 94, 105, 114, 115). He ridicules the Spaniard Egnatius for showing off his native custom of using one's own piss for a dentifrice, when Egnatius flashes his pearly toothed grin (c.39). Including the scazons (limping iambics), in ten out of twelve iambic poems Catullus engages in some type of reprimand, usually bawdy.[23]

Catullus specifically mentions iambic only three times (c. 36, 40, 54), but in each instance he affirms that effective iambic defames. He writes his three referents to iambic in hendecasyllables, but even this ironic move corroborates the assumption that iambic is synonymous with verbal assault. Catullus acts as if he is going to disavow iambic in c.36, when he tells his lady that he will make good on her vow that they will be together again, if she first burns the "worst poet's most excellent poems" (*electissima pessimi poetae*, v.6). She assumes that she has consigned to the fire the iambics Catullus wrote against her. Catullus instead fulfills the promise for her by turning Volusius' annals into fouled paper (*cacata charta*, v.1) before he burns them. The joke lies on the surface: Catullus takes advantage of the woman's superficial literary taste. She does not have the sense to judge the good writer from the bad or bad writing from good, a determination that cannot be made on the basis of content alone, using a paradigm, such as, invective (bad), history (good) / iambist (bad), historian (good). Catullus is more than willing to burn the "most excellent work" (*electissima*) Volusius turned out, after he has smeared it with the worst that he, an iambist and a good poet, has to give out. An iambist is good not because he recants but because his poetry achieves its appropriate end, which in this case would be defamation. It is the recantation's attack on Volusius and the literary tastes of the girl that affirms Catullus' excellence as an iambic poet. Neither does Catullus soften the irony in this disavowal by writing it in hendecasyllables. He calls on his hendecasyllables twice by name, both threats: once to compel Asinius Murrucinus to return the keepsake-napkin Asinius stole (c.12); once to compel a woman to give back the writing tablets she took (c.42). Catullus' hendecasyllables are strong because they carry the force

[23] The exceptions are c.4 and 31. C.4 (trimeter) gives the history of a Pontic galley in an extended personification reminiscent of Callimachus (Thomson, 1998: 212–215), and c.31 (scazon) praises Catullus' Sirmio. It is worth noting that in both poems Catullus likely celebrates his return home from his service in Bithynia, and it is hard not to read through his joy his complaint about being financially buggered there by the propraetor Memmius (c. 28).

of invective as well as his straight iambs, and so for Catullus to swap out iambics for hendecasyllables does nothing to tone down the mockery of his iambic recantation.[24]

Although Catullus writes a wide variety of moods into his songs, he keeps the *telos* for iambic stable: hard invective meant to disgrace and dominate. At the end of our present collection (c.116), Catullus, while writing in elegy, searches for some lines of Callimachus that might placate Gellius, whom Catullus made infamous for incest (c.74, 80, 88, 89, 90, 91). Catullus hopes that he can stop Gellius from aiming weapons at him (no doubt some lines of retaliatory invective: *tela infesta ⟨meum⟩ mittere in usque caput*, 116.4). He concludes that his research to locate a Callimachean mollification is useless (*hunc video mihi frusta sumptum esse laborem*, 5). He will survive Gellius' verbal barrage and launch more attacks of his own that will punish him properly (*contra nos tela ista tua evitabimus acta, / at fixus nostris tu dabis supplicium*, 7–8). The cycle of retaliation/counter-retaliation rolls on from Catullus' hendecasyllables through his elegies.[25]

Since Catullan iambic aims to punish deviant behavior, it is a good only from the perspective of the poet (or his group) not the target. One wants to be on the giving and not the receiving end of the attack:

> Quaenam te mala mens, miselle Ravide,
> agit praecipitem in meos iambos?
> quis deus tibi non bene advocatus
> vercordem parat excitare rixam?
> an ut pervenias in ora vulgi?
> quid vis? qualubet esse notus optas?
> eris, quandoquidem meos amores
> cum longa voluisti amare poena. (Cat. 40)

> What bad judgment, poor little Ravidus, drives you headfirst into my iambs? Which of the gods did you invoke so profanely that he is set to provoke an insane fight? Or could it be that you want everyone talking

[24] Hendacasyllables have a wide range, which includes anger (cf. Plin. *Ep.* 4.14.2–3: *accipies cum hac epistula hendacasyllabos nostros ... his iocamur ludimus amamus dolemus querimur irascimur*).

[25] I am not arguing for a romanticized view of Catullus, but rather that he uses invective to enforce a particular code of behavior; e.g., David Wray (2001) contends that Catullan invective asserts a definite character for the Roman male. On the whole, iambic for Horace is more dialogic. Attempts to explore the purpose for Catullan invective should also guard against underestimating the role of laughter in his iambic (Newman, 1990). In spite of Catullus' "Alexandrian modification," Newman (on c.116, 1990: 45, 133–137) characterizes Catullus as also following "the older, wounding iambic" (74).

> about you? What do you want? Do you want to be famous no matter the cost? You will be, seeing that you wanted to love my beloved at the risk of incurring a lengthy punishment.

The plot is familiar: Ravidus started an affair with Catullus' darling and Catullus is repaying him, attempting to chase him away with a threat, versified defamation. What is unusual about the scene is how Catullus presents himself as surprised that Ravidus made a play for his beloved in the first place. He assumes that even the prospect of iambic retaliation should be enough to frighten off the average rival. Ravidus' resistance so amazes Catullus that it elicits from him a series of five questions (1–6), punctuated by a final promise that iambic retaliation is now inevitable (7–8). But where is the actual assault on Ravidus in this bit of invective? Or is Catullan iambic in this case all bark and no bite? However sarcastic his threat may be (*an ut pervenias in ora vulgi?*; *qualubet esse notus optas?*) Catullus' shock at Ravidus' insistence gives away his expectations for the iambic mode [attack = punishment = compliance], which makes his stubborn opponent a very poor target. Ravidus' deviant behavior is not so much loving Catullus' beloved—lovers should anticipate having rivals—but the fact that Ravidus does not understand the power of iambic and respond to the threat correctly. No rational person would willingly risk being on the receiving end of Catullus' iambic.[26] Therefore, Ravidus must be out of his mind (*mala mens*, 1), have committed some sacrilege against one of the gods (3–4), or be so hungry for fame that he is willing to subject himself to the punishment of endless gossip (5–6). The effectiveness and humor of Catullus' attack on Ravidus depends on the external audience assuming along with Catullus that iambic recriminations should not just be laughed off and are best avoided altogether. Caesar, in contrast to Ravidus, responds more as one would expect. Catullus assumes that launching even innocent iambics against Caesar's staff will anger their general:

> irascere iterum meis iambis
> inmerentibus, unice imperator. (Cat. 54.6–7)[27]

> Once again you will be angry at my innocent iambics, chief-general.

[26] Lucian (*Pseudol.* 1) recollects Archilochus asking one of his targets why he would be so willing to provide material for an iambist, who is in attack-mode, that he would grab hold of the poet as if he were hanging on to a "cicada on the fly." If Lucian's memory serves him well, then there is Archilochean precedent for Catullus' interrogation of Ravidus; cf. Archil. 172 W.

[27] It is uncertain whether or not these last two verses belong with what is now c.54, and

That is the way of it—iambic inflicts a penalty, which leads to more anger and/or acquiescence.

The expectations for iambic in Catullus show just what Horace was up against. The assumption was that iambic should hunt down and if necessary destroy its target (*agentia verba Lycamben*). Horace does not brush aside this perspective, but gives it a prominent voice by allowing his iambic characters and audience to reflect a Catullan mindset. The iambist of epode 12, in words that echo Catullus' invective against Ravidus, expresses similar shock, mixed with disdain, when his Lykambean-styled assault does not scare off an oversexed woman (*Quid tibi vis*, epode 12.1; cf. *quid vis*, Cat. 40.6). The iambist decides that he had better flee her (12.25–26). Likewise, Horace's disavowal of Archilochean assault shows how insane Catullus' Ravidus was. Horace distances himself from the words that drove Lykambes to his death (*non res et **agentia** verba Lycamben*, *Epist.* I.19.25b), while Ravidus drove himself head over heels into Catullus' attacking iambics (*te mala mens … **agit** praecipitem in meos iambos*?, 1b–2). And Canidia will continue her attacks on her enemy until she has her vengeance (*'plorem artis in te nil **agentis** exitus?'* epode 17.81). It is little wonder that Horace was so adamant in defending his iambs against slavish copy-cats who likely interpreted their Archilochus via a narrow reading lens of a particular brand of iambic reception (*Epist.* I.19.1–18). It would not be easy to resist the perception that iambic should "search and destroy," especially within a civil war environment. Horace had his hands full.

Catullus perhaps can be let off, but Archilochus not so easily. However hard-hitting Catullan iambic may be judged to be, no one died from his invective. In fact, when Catullus lampoons Nonius and Vatinius in Archilochean trimeters, he turns Archilochus' reputation around and attacks the two by wishing for his own death not theirs (*Quid est, Catulle? quid moraris emori?*, 52.1, 4). Catullus gives this invective its punch-line by switching the role of the iambist from murderer to suicide victim: "If you, Nonius and Vatinius, are going to live and do well, it will be better for me to die." While Lykambes' daughters dangle in the background of Catullus' iambic impatience with these two politicians, if there is any humor

---

exactly which of Caesar's associates is being attacked in the preceding verses (compare Merrill, 1893: ad loc., with Bickel, 1949: 13–20; see also Tandoi, 1976: 5–28). What is certain is that Catullus expects his iambics will rouse Caesar's temper, as they did in the past. It took Caesar a good while before he reconciled with Catullus, and only then because of his own friendship with the poet's father (Suet. *Caes.* 73).

in Catullus' play on the tradition it is most macabre. Given such pervasive precedent for the severity of Archilochean invective, Horace was right not to trivialize the problem that Archilochus' reputation presented him. Looking past the tendency to biographical reading, which the *testimonia* on Archilochus exhibit and against which Catullus protests (c. 16; 36),[28] the witnesses as a whole are struggling in a most human way to explain how a poet with blood on his hands could be declared sacrosanct, worthy of divine protection. The logic behind this obsession with Archilochean im/piety is that iambic, imbued with blood-guilt, should spill over and stain the poet.

There is no denying the gods' blessing on Archilochus or avoiding the moral question it raises. The Mnesiepes Inscription (3rd century BC), which was set in the Archilocheion, a place of sacrifice to honor the poet in his homeland of Paros,[29] attests that the Muses gave Archilochus his song (*SEG* 15.517, A[E_1] col. 2), and the *testimonia* routinely designate him the attendant of the Muses.[30] By right then Archilochus enjoyed the privilege of divine protection both in life and death. While the young Archilochus was performing at a festival, he was accused of being too iambic (ἰαμβικώτερο[ν), and as a result a plague was sent to punish the city and it lasted until appropriate honors were paid him (*SEG* 15.517, A[E_1] col. 3). Archilochus died in battle, killed by a man called Corax. Even though Corax pleaded military circumstance and self-defense, the

---

[28] Critias (44 Deils-Kranz, Archil. 295 W = Aelian, *V.H.* 10.13) is often cited for the "biographical fallacy." This may be: following Critias' logic, Ovid was sure to put himself in jeopardy when he wrote his elegies in the first person (Ov. *Trist.* 3.2.5–8; cf. Plin. *Ep.* 4.14.1–4, n.b. *sed quia timidiores sumus*). Critias' invective, however, is not so much concerned with the particular details of Archilochus' life divulged in his poetry but the implications of Archilochus incriminating himself and ruining his own reputation: being born from a slave, his poverty, adultery, hubris, and shameless cowardice. Archilochus is so obsessed with blame that he does not know better than to treat differently self and other, friend and foe (compare Ovid: *nec meus indicio latitantes versus amicos / protrahit.*, *Trist.* 3.4.71–72a; *causa meae cunctis nimium quoque nota ruinae / indicio non est testificanda meo.*, *Trist.* 4.10.99–100). Archilochus' penchant for blame makes him a rather poor ethicist—or contrary to Critias, a really fine one, self-aware of his own shortcomings (cf. Rankin, 1975: 324–334; Cassio, 1984: 61–65; Slings, 1990: 27; Rosen, 2007: 248–255; Rotstein, 2007: 139–154; 2010: 300–316).

[29] SEG 15.517 A(E_1) col. 2.16–19: χρήσαντος δὲ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ταῦτα τόν τε τόπον / καλοῦμεν Ἀρχιλόχειον καὶ τοὺς βωμοὺς ἱδρύμεθα / καὶ θύομεν καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ Ἀρχιλόχωι καὶ / τιμῶμεν αὐτόν, καθ' ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἐθέσπισεν ἡμῖν. For background on the Mnesiepes Inscription, see Pòrtulas in Miralles and Pòrtulas (1983: 61–80).

[30] E.g., *IG* 12(5).445 (B col. 7) *Sosthenis Inscriptio*; Plu. *De sera numinis vindicta* 17.560e; Gal. *Protr.* 9.22; D. Chr. 33.11–12; Aristid. *Or.* 46; Eus. *PE* 33.8; Origen *Cels.* 3.25.20.

Pythian banned him from Apollo's temple until he placated Archilochus' spirit (Plu. *De sera numinis vindicta* 17.560e).[31] Archilochus was praised for his artistic skill and metrical innovation, proof that he was loved by Apollo and his Muses (Quint. 10.1.60; Ps.-Plu. *de Musica* 28.1140f–1141b; Marius Victorinus, Keil VI. 104.7; Schol. ad Pi. *O*. 9.1–4):

> Ἀρχίλοχον καὶ στᾶθι καὶ εἴσιδε τὸν πάλαι ποιητὰν
> τὸν τῶν ἰάμβων, οὗ τὸ μυρίον κλέος
> διῆλθε κἠπὶ νύκτα καὶ ποτ' ἀῶ.
> ἦ ῥά νιν αἱ Μοῦσαι καὶ ὁ Δάλιος ἠγάπευν Ἀπόλλων,
> ὡς ἐμμελής τ' ἐγένετο κἠπιδέξιος
> ἔπεά τε ποιεῖν πρὸς λύραν τ' ἀείδειν.
>
> (Theoc. *epig.* 21 *HE* 3434–3439)

> Stop and gaze on Archilochus, the bygone poet of the iamb, whose fame beyond measure has traversed both night and day. To be sure the Muses and Delian Apollo loved him; he had such a melodic spirit and skill for composing verses and singing them to the lyre.

Archilochus' fame continued growing and took hold early in Rome (Nep. fr.7 Marshall = Gell. 17.21.8). Such a reputation for excellence makes the unease over Archilochus' piety more acute, and the anxiety in turn makes for good drama, when Lykambes' daughters from their grave call on the Muses to give answer for how they could inspire Archilochus' savage attacks against their virginity, a virtual war against women and an act of showing favor to a profane man (γυναικεῖον δ' ἔτραπεν ἐς πόλεμον. / Πιερίδες, τί κόρῃσιν ἔφ' ὑβριστῆρας ἰάμβους / ἐτράπετ', οὐχ ὁσίῳ φωτὶ χαριζόμεναι;, *A.P.* 7.352 = *HE* 4747b–4749). As the Christian era takes hold the questions lose their legendary quality and become prosaic, blunt, and declarative: "How could you have decided that Archilochus was worthy of heaven?" (τί ποτ' οὖν ἦν τοῦτο δι' ὅ σοι Ἀρχίλοχος ἔδοξεν ἄξιος εἶναι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ;, Oenomaus, ad Eus. *PE* 5.33.5). "I doubt whether a respectable person would say such things as Archilochus' unholy iambics embrace" (οὐκ οἶδα … καὶ κόσμιος τοιαῦτα λέγοι ἄν, ὁποῖα περιέχουσιν οἱ μὴ σεμνοὶ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου ἰάμβοι., Origen, *Cels.* 3.25.25).[32] Archilochus was pious contrary to expectation.

---

[31] Cf. testt. 12–18 (Gerber, 1999).

[32] Christian ritual and practice grappled with the appropriate limits and practices for iambic-styled anger and abuse (νυνὶ δὲ ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα, ὀργήν, θυμόν, κακίαν, βλασφημίαν, αἰσχρολογίαν ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν·, *N.T.*, Col. 3.8; also αἰσχρότης καὶ μωρολογία, Eph. 5.4). Within this string of nouns βλασφημία technically signifies "slander" / "defamation," speech intended to vilify and harm (cf. λοίδορος, I. Cor. 5.11, 6.10–11), rather than irreverent speech against God. *Αἰσχρολογία*, common in the

The inextricable combination of the beautiful and divinely sanctioned with the reprehensible and foul in one artist—as in "a Mozart"—causes a fairly predictable and consistent reaction among writers and critics. Some who recognize Archilochus' greatness feel compelled to qualify their praise and take some soap to Archilochus like old-fashioned stern parents washing out their child's mouth:[33]

> ὅτι τῶν σπουδαίων οὐδὲ θανόντων οἱ θεοὶ λήθην τίθενται. Ἀρχίλοχον γοῦν ποιητὴν γενναῖον τἄλλα, εἴ τις αὐτοῦ τὸ αἰσχροεπὲς καὶ τὸ κακορρῆμον ἀφέλοι, καὶ οἱονεὶ κηλῖδα ἀπορρύψαι, ὁ Πύθιος ἠλέει τεθνεῶτα ... (Ael. fr. 80 Hercher, *Suda* i.376.11)
>
> The gods do not forget the good even after their death. Take for instance Archilochus—a noble poet in any other way if one were to eliminate his foul mouth and slander and wash them out like a stain—after his death the Pythian showed him mercy ...

Others justify Archilochus' attacks on the grounds that he was acting as an ethicist safeguarding the community by censuring those who violated its standards.[34] According to Dio Chrysostom, Archilochus ranks ahead of Homer: the iambist is willing to censure himself, and humanity is more in need of correction than flattery. If a poet goes to extremes in either praise (Homer) or blame (Archilochus), the latter extreme is the more valuable (D. Chr. 33.11–12). Aelius Aristides states that Archilochus did not defame the best and most esteemed among the Greeks, when he attacked Lykambes among others (*Or.* 46). The implication is that Archilochus' targets merited invective: Lykambes was an oath-breaker.

The problem then on how to evaluate Archilochus' reputation narrows. It is not the use of iambic/invective *per se*, about which the Romans were never shy,[35] but Archilochus' failure to confine his rage to just limits. For

---

worship of Demeter and Dionysus (*infra*), could be considered problematic within young and developing Christian communities, struggling to establish a distinctive identity (see Halliwell, 2004: 116, n.3, citing in addition Adkin, 1985: 149–152, and Screech, 1997: 132–140). This is not to say that Christianity, its developmental stages included, did not resort to using invective to define itself and others (e.g., Gregory Nazianzen's *First*, *Second Invective Against Julian the Emperor*, *Or.* 4; *Or.* 5) or criticize with the view to correct within its own communities; on the practice of παρρησία in the early church, see Glad, 1995; Fitzgerald, 1996; Fiore, 2004: 271–294; Sampley, 2004: 295–322.

33 Cf. Quint. 10.1.60; Eus. *PE* 5.33.1.

34 Archilochus as "moral enforcer" continues to be a principal defense for Archilochean iambic (Brown, 1997: 69; for the same justification for Roman invective, see Wray, 2001; Hickson-Hahn, 1998: 1–36).

35 Any one of Cicero's better known speeches and prosecutions proves the effectiveness and appeal of invective for a Roman audience (e.g., *Pis.*; *Verr.*; *Phil.*; cf. Merrill, 1975;

example, just like Archilochus, Cato the Younger found himself tangled up in a love affair (Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 7). He was engaged to a woman named Lepida, who before had been betrothed to Metellus Scipio. Before Cato could marry her, Scipio changed his mind and won the girl back. Cato felt free to attack Scipio with all the bitterness of Archilochean iambic (τῷ πικρῷ προσχρησάμενος τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου), and yet for all his anger he managed to avoid Archilochus' "intemperance and childishness" (τὸ δὲ ἀκόλαστον ἀφεὶς καὶ παιδαριῶδες). Archilochus, justified or not, was never able to shake free from the longest standing charge against him, that his song was too iambic (ἰαμβικώτερο[ν, Mnesiepes Inscription, *SEG* 15.517, A[E_1] col. 3).[36] For this reason, there is no shortage of poets ready to distance themselves from the extreme in Archilochean iambic. The most damaging and often cited testimony belongs to Pindar and Callimachus:

ἐμὲ δὲ χρεών
φεύγειν δάκος ἀδινὸν κακαγοριᾶν.
εἶδον γὰρ ἑκὰς ἐὼν τὰ πόλλ' ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ
ψογερὸν Ἀρχίλοχον βαρυλόγοις ἔχθεσιν
πιαινόμενον· (Pi. *P.* 2.52b–56a)

But I am obligated to flee fierce-toothed slander. For I have seen at a distance Archilochus on many occasion beyond remedy, relishing his blame and fattening himself on his hate-filled rantings.

εἵλκυϲε δὲ δριμύν τε χόλον κυνὸϲ ὀξύ τε κέντρον
σφηκόϲ, ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων δ' ἰὸν ἔχει ϲτόματοϲ (Call. fr. 380 Pf.)

He took in the dog's bitter bile and the wasp's piercing sting, and from both he drew his mouth's poison.

Both poets make their point by turning against the iambist motifs common to invective, excess and animalism.[37] Pindar's Archilochus is a fat glutton, who addicted cannot stop gorging himself on hate-filled words.

Hughes, 1998: 570–577; Sussman, 1998: 114–128; Corbeill, 2002: 197–218). We may claim not to appreciate political attack ads, but candidates continue to use them because they work.

[36] Cf. … Ἀρχίλοχον, ὃς τὸ πάντων ἔξοχον καὶ δυσχερέστερον εἶδος τῆς ποιήσεως μετεχειρίζετο, τοὺς ἰάμβους ("Archilochus, who took up a form of poetry by far and away more ill-tempered than all others, iambic," Aristid. *Or.* 46, p. 293 Jebb); also Plu. *de Curiositate* 10.520a–b.

[37] On the tendency to identify blame-speech with gluttony and other abuses of the mouth, see Worman (2008).

Callimachus' Archilochus takes in dog's bile and the wasp's sting. He does not suffer or die from them himself; he turns the toxins into words and spews them out like poison.

To set the dilemma in a contemporary context, one might ask whether Archilochean iambic is the equivalent of a modern political attack ad, justifiable in its extremes to a part of society, the iambist and his group, because it enforces the standards to which they give their allegiance? If Horace was to succeed in bringing Parian iambics with an Archilochean spirit to Rome in any form other than "assault poetry," he would have to free Archilochus from the reputation assigned to him by the reception of his poetry without belittling him by lessening the vitality of iambic. Horace appears to put himself between the proverbial "rock and a hard spot:" how to follow Archilochus without being read as "Archilochean."

Horace on Archilochus: The Limits of Mockery

Horace works his way out of the dilemma and gives definition to his iambic by pulling a surprise, a reversal of conceded expectations. Three of the four times Horace names Archilochus he acknowledges received opinion about "Archilochus" on two counts: on one hand, his attack on the Lykambids was justified (epode 6.13–14; *Ars* 79); on the other, invective can be taken to dangerous extremes (*Epist.* I.19.25, 28).[38] In this way, Horace recognizes what is a troubling tension within the Archilochean tradition between the positive and negative. Invective can play a role in righting wrongs, but when it lacks restraint, so that it becomes equated with winning vengeance and power, it tends to turn destructive. Therefore, iambic scurrility in its varied contexts, especially if it becomes linked with vendetta, provokes considerations of justice.

First, Horace's description of Sappho's and Alcaeus' debt to Archilochus values interdependence and difference so as to reject iambic as a destructive force. When Horace distances himself from the Archilochean-Lykambid tradition of iambic in *Epist.* I.19, he follows the precedent set by the lyricists Sappho and Alcaeus. The Lesbian poets utilized Archilochean meters (*temperat Archilochi Musam pede mascula Sappho,/temperat Alcaeus*, 28–29a), but Horace argues they retained their distinctiveness (*sed rebus et ordine dispar*, 29b) by emphatically rejecting an iambic that ended in the death of the Lykambids (*nec socerum*

[38] *S.* II.3.12 groups Archilochus with the Greek comedians; see *infra*.

quaerit quem versibus oblinat atris, / nec sponsae laqueum famoso carmine nectit, 30–31). Their use of Archilochean meters does not signal slavish compliance.[39] Horace's placement of the Muse between Archilochus and Sappho (*Archilochi Musam ... Sappho*) creates controversy over exactly who is tempering whom. Do Sappho and Alcaeus temper Archilochus' Muse (*temperat Archilochi Musam*) or do the lyricists fit their own Muse to Archilochean rhythms (*temperat Archilochi* [*Musam* "suam"] *pede ...* [*mascula Sappho, / temperat Alcaeus*]), or both? The alliteration and assonance in *Musam ... mascula* overcomes the beginning of the line and associates the Muse with Sappho so that Archilochus becomes her metrical model (*Musam* "suam" ... *mascula Sappho*), but the more normative word-grouping (*temperat* [*Archilochi*] *Musam ... Sappho*), reinforced by the repetition of *temperat* ("moderates") and by the double *nec ... nec* at the head of the verses denouncing the assault on Lykambes, just as strongly suggests that Archilochean iambic in its most infamous and defining moment as far as its reception was concerned went to a point where the lyricists would not go, and they tempered Archilochus. To set apart the Lesbian lyre even further Horace expands his terse—and by comparison almost benign—disavowal (*non ... agentia verba Lycamben*) into two verses, one of the most negative renditions of "Archilochus against the Lykambids." Horace charges Archilochus with what could fairly be described as a criminal act.[40] He assigns Archilochus intent,

[39] Iambic was never only a matter of meter (Dover, 1964: 183–189; West, 1974: 22–23; Nagy, 1976: 191; Carey, 2009: 149–150; Rotstein, 2010: 183–188).

[40] The syntax and argument (vv.28–31) are difficult. What is clear is that Horace is defending his originality; precisely how is less certain. I think it likely that Horace takes advantage of some intentional *aporia*. Fraenkel, 1957: 342–347, argues that *Archilochi Musam* by regular word-order must stand as a unit (the noun immediately following governing the genitive), meaning that Sappho tempers Archilochus (against Fraenkel, see N.-H., 1970: *C.* I.35.6, ***ruris** colonus, te **dominam** aequoris*; previously Bentley, 1711: ad loc.; Orelli, 1838: vv.28–29; K.-H., 1884/1957: v.28; Wickham, 1891: vv.28–31, 28; recently Mayer, 1994: v.28; cf. Housman, 1902: 445: "... where every Roman child felt in the marrow of his bones that *ruris* depended on *dominam*, though in modern times only a handful of scholars have recognized it ..."). Fraenkel limits this "tempering" to form, and translates, "Sappho of the manlike spirit softens the poetry (the form of the poetry) of Archilochus by the way in which she treats the metre" (346). The problem then, as Bentley indicates, is that the two verses on the Lykambids (30–31) become too graphic of a tautology (*non res et agentia verba Lycamben*, 25), especially with a *sed* (29) rather than "et." Horace's argument flows more naturally, if we take him to mean that his use of Archilochus parallels that of Sappho and Alcaeus. They do owe a debt to Archilochus in meter: "Sappho modulates her own Muse to the beat of Archilochus." Fraenkel's estimation of Horatian syntax is not to be discounted totally. Horace's wording (*temperat ... temperat ... nec ... nec*) and the tautology, if it is to

opportunity, and means: "Archilochus searches out" (*quaerit*), uses his "black verses to smear" (*versibus oblinat atris*) and "his song of defamation to weave the noose" (*laqueum famoso carmine nectit*).[41] This details exactly what *agentia verba Lycamben* means: seeking, vilifying, killing. Horace's two-way syntax on who tempers whom is not ambiguous: it illustrates how strongly he rejects a one-sided iambic aimed at domination by showing poets in a reciprocal relationship, competing yet dependent on each other (iambic/lyric). Horace is illustrating exactly how slavish imitators miss the mark: the continuation of the literary tradition, in this case iambic, does not rely on one poet playing the sycophant and

be called such, stress the notion that the lyricists avoided a certain view of Archilochus, and so to apply Fraenkel more broadly, "The process of *temperare* ["moderating"] takes place when something Archilochean is turned into something Sapphic and Alcaic" (345). Fraenkel instinctively grasps that Horace's lyre is going to make something more of Parian iambic than invective defined by death. The scholiasts' reading of the argument, hard to defend strictly by the syntax, catches the spirit of the entire context: "He says Archilochus' meter, which we imitate, we temper with the verses of Alcaeus and Sappho, whom I imitate" (*Metrum, inquit, Archilochi, quod nos imitamur, temperamus versibus Alc⟨a⟩ei et Sappho, quos imitor*, Ps-Acro, v.28; cf. Porph., v.29). This interprets well Horace's transition from the *Epodes* to the *Odes*, and again explains why he combines the defense of his iambics with his lyrics. Newman (1998: 112–114), on the other hand, notes that Philodemus saw in Sappho an un-Archilochean type of iambic (καὶ Σαπφώ τινα ἰαμβικῶς ποιεῖ καὶ Ἀρχίλοχος οὐκ ἰαμβικῶς, P. Herc.460, fr. 8.10–13) and that Demetrius described her as jesting (Ἄλλως δὲ σκώπτει τὸν ἄγροικον νυμφίον, καὶ τὸν θυρωρὸν τὸν ἐν τοῖς γάμοις, εὐτελέστατα, *De Eloc*. 167). Newman provides for examples Sappho's exaggerated treatment of the doorwarden and bridegroom in her epithalamia (frr. 110a, 111, and 115 L.-P). On the basis of such examples, Newman must conclude that Horace's iambics against women are most un-Sapphic and very Archilochean. Newman's primary point, however, should not be lost, namely that responsion, female to male in Newman's discussion, constitutes a vital component of archaic iambic, and I would add that the strong voice that Horace gives to Canidia supports Newman's central thesis. The iambic Horace finds a way to be both Archilochean and Sapphic. Perhaps it is not so incidental that Diphilus' Σαπφώ portrays Archilochus as Sappho's lover. For further conjecture on Sappho as iambist and for varying perspectives on her tone and effect, compare Aloni (2001: 29–40) and O'Higgins (2003: 86–97); Aloni, 29: "Iambic Sappho's aggressive performance is directed against targets which are not different from those peculiar to iambic poets. The modalities (except for meter) as well as the aim of the aggression are also similar."; O'Higgins, 95: "Alternatively, it [Sappho fr. 115] may have formed part of an openly adversarial exchange between male and female attendants at the wedding; the mood will have been festive and lighthearted, rather than cruel and destructive." Rotstein (2010: 35–38, 55, 140) cautions against designating Sappho an iambist without qualification, even though she composed "some poems in the iambic manner." How "masculine" is *mascula Sappho* (*Epist*. I.19.28) is open for debate.

[41] *Atris* has sinister overtones (*S*. II.7.115; *C*. II.3.16, cf. Verg. *A*. 10.77; *C*. II.16.2; III.1.40; 14.13; 27.18; cf. N.-H., 1970, 1978: *C*. I.37.27; II.14.17 ad loc.). When combined with *oblinat*, "smear," (a word used by Horace only here and *Epist*. II.1.204; cf. Cic. *Rep*.

submitting completely to another. In Horatian poetics, there is interplay. When an earlier poet influences a later, the later poet through his emulation (imitation inclusive of creativity and rivalry) influences how the earlier poet is perceived. Each poet has an effect on the other: Archilochus on Sappho and Alcaeus; Sappho and Alcaeus on Archilochus; all on Horace and Horace on them all. Through his own iambic, then, Horace has the chance to recover and alter Archilochus' reception for the better. Michael Putnam (*Poetic Interplay*, 2006:10) illustrates the same dynamic between Horace and Catullus:

> But, along with our reading forward from Catullus into Horace, as we duly acknowledge how one master surmounts the anxiety of influence his predecessor has provoked, we also work backwards with new eyes, and with a deepened sense of admiration for Catullus and his accomplishment.

The opposite result, however, is also possible, and I suspect that this is Horace's real fear in *Epist.* I.19, that derivative imitations and shortsighted interpretations of (his own) poetry are not to be overlooked because eventually they might well have a negative impact on the original poet's (his own) reputation.

Second, Horace's Parian iambic acknowledges the human desire for justice. The one time Horace names Archilochus in the *Epodes* he affirms that the iambist is like the Archilochus who aimed his iambics at Lykambes, because the father broke his oath that he would give his daughter to the poet in marriage (epode 6.10–14). Horace espouses the Archilochean sense of fair play, but reverses its application. The iambist of epode 6 is facing down an opponent guilty of attacking the innocent. At that point Horace's iambist turns bestial and threatens the wildest counter-attack

3.8: *et Philus: "heia vero" inquit, "geram morem vobis et me oblinam sciens . . ."*), *atris*, v.30, produces an ugly, sensational image—the smear from Archilochus' black verses stains Lykambes' face for all to see, like Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter* ("All the light and graceful foliage of her character had been withered up by this red-hot brand, and had long ago fallen away, leaving a bare and harsh outline, which might have been repulsive had she possessed friends or companions to be repelled by it.," Ch. 13) but more like Poe's iambic pestilence in his "Masque of the Read Death." "But the mummer had gone so far as to assume the type of the Red Death. His vesture was dabbled in *blood*—and his broad brow, with all the features of the face, was besprinkled with the scarlet horror. When the eyes of Prince Prospero fell upon this spectral image (which with a slow and solemn movement, as if more fully to sustain its *rôle*, stalked to and fro among the waltzers) he was seen to be convulsed, in the first moment with a strong shudder either of terror or distaste; but, in the next, his brow reddened with rage." Poe understands the menace of iambic retribution. To stain is to admit being stained. Within an instant Propsero will himself fall victim to the unmasked Red Death.

against the unjust assailant (… *namque in malos asperrimus / parata tollo cornua*, vv.11–12),[42] as though the iambist were Archilochus, Lykambes' spurned son-in-law (*qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener*, v.13). It is as if Horace is playing two traditional views of Archilochus against each other to present both sides of justice: Archilochus the just versus the unjust iambist. Lykambes was faithless and merited censure. And the innocent deserve to be protected, if they are attacked without just cause. Invective should not have free rein to harm the guiltless.

Horace, "early" and "late," relates how mockery grew out of control and therefore invited limits. Horace recounts that is was necessary to regulate Fescennine verse, enjoyed at festivals, because, unrestrained through the years, it began destroying honorable homes:

Fescennina per hunc invecta licentia morem
versibus alternis opprobria rustica fudit.
libertasque recurrentis accepta per annos
lusit amabiliter, donec iam saevus apertam
in rabiem coepit verti iocus et per honestas
ire domos impune minax. doluere cruento
dente lacessiti; fuit intactis quoque cura
condicione super communi. quin etiam lex
poenaque lata, malo quae nollet carmine quemquam
describi. vertere modum formidine fustis
ad bene dicendum delectandumque redacti. (*Epist.* II.1.145–155)

Fescennine license, conveyed through this custom, poured out its rustic insults in alternating verses. The freedom, celebrated through the recurring years, sported happily, until jesting now cruel began to turn into open rage and to roam from house to house, with impunity threatening decent folk. They suffered, lacerated deeply by bloody tooth. Even those not affected became concerned over the state of the community. And so, a law and penalty were enacted to keep anyone from being maligned by a malicious song. They changed their tune, and their fear of punishment brought them back to fair and charming speech.

At issue in Horace's description is the potential for a comic form to morph (*invecta*, *verti*, 145, 149) into the tragic, when it is performed in an extreme a manner: "jesting changed to cruelty and then to madness, raging with impunity from house to house; they were pained, lacerated by a bloody tooth" (*saevus* … *iocus* … *in rabiem* … *impune minax* … *cruento dente*, 148–151). The whole tenor of the descent from festive fun

[42] Horace's "wild" (*asper*) often describes beasts (*S.* II.6.82; *C.* I.23.9; 37.26; III.2.10) or persons behaving like animals (epode 5.25–28; *C.* I.33.6; 35.9; *Ars* 163). Epode 6 is the only time Horace uses the superlative.

to ruinous stalking echoes the "too iambic" Archilochus and his action against the Lykambids.

Horace is writing the Greek iambic and comic traditions into how Latin forms of laughter changed into verbal assault requiring regulation.[43] In his short summary on the inventors of Greek drama Horace also comments that the role of the chorus in Old Comedy was restricted by law because its invective became excessive:

> successit vetus his comoedia, non sine multa
> laude; sed in vitium libertas excidit et vim
> dignam lege regi. lex est accepta chorusque
> turpiter obticuit sublato iure nocendi. (*Ars* 281–284)
>
> There followed after these tragedians Old Comedy, very praiseworthy; but its freedom degenerated into vice and violence, which merited the rule of law. The law was approved and the chorus in disgrace fell silent with its right to injure taken away.

When the younger Horace, while defending his own satire, evaluated Lucilius' pungent criticism, he cited for models the Greek comedians ("Eupolis, Cratinus, Aristophanes, and the others"),[44] but he was careful to state specifically that they took into account whether the individual lampooned deserved the attack:

---

[43] In general, the Greeks considered revenge an act of justice, but not all forms of revenge were considered equally just (see, Seaford, 1994: 25–29; Cohen, 1995; McHardy, 2008). It is highly contested to what degree Old Comedy was legally regulated, and if so were the restraints effective (summarized by Halliwell, 2008: 244 n.70; compare Forsdyke, 2005: 82, on the legal exemptions for festival occasions). Horace will not solve these questions. He takes for granted that there was a point in time that Old Comedy lost its immunity and that a law affected its performance, and he is willing to draw parallels between Greek and Roman literary history even if he does not equate them (see Feeney, 2002: 178–179). Horace is not writing as a legal historian. For example, his compressed overview and quick transition (*quin etiam*, 152) do not clarify if or how long social pressure restrained the verbal violence before a legal remedy was put in place; compare Feeney (2002: 182) and S. Braund (2004: 414–415). Neither does he cite a specific law here or at *S.* II.1.79–82. *Malum carmen* in the Twelve Tables was concerned with magical incantations (Plin. *H.N.* 28.17–18) rather than slander (Cic. *Rep.* 4.12). I, therefore, hesitate to argue that Horace gives an accurate history of Greek drama—although if a lawyer like Cicero can apply a law on magic to slander, license can be granted for Horace (cf. Brink, 1982: nn.152, 153, 154)—but rather his account assumes that festive and comic raillery lose their rightful character when they cause harm. It should be noted in reference to Horace's own understanding of iambic that Fescennine verses were a communal form of exchange (*versibus alternis*, v.146).

[44] The poets' names reinforce comedy's moralizing bent: "good for the city," Eu-polis; "man of strength," Crat-inus; "best appearance," Aristo-phanes (see Freudenburg, 2001: 20; Harrison, 2007b: 77). To what degree Horace here associates himself with the tradition of Old Comedy is debated (e.g., Scodel, 1987: 199–200, 214).

Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae
atque alii quorum comoedia prisca virorum est,
si quis erat dignus describi, quod malus ac fur,
quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui
famosus, multa cum libertate notabant.
hinc omnis pendet Lucilius, hosce secutus
mutatis tantum pedibus numerisque … (*S.* I.4.1–7)

The poets Eupolis, Cratinus, and Aristophanes, and the other original authors of Old Comedy felt quite free to censure someone if they deserved the criticism; if they were for example a no good thief, adulterer, murderer, or some other scoundrel. On these Lucilius entirely depends: he followed these poets changing only the metrical foot and their rhythm …

Accordingly Horace's satire comes with a degree of introspection, a self-consciousness introduced by a blame-artist who feels the need to justify his use of criticism. So Horace begins his second book of satires by inviting Julius Caesar's lawyer Trebatius to give him legal advice about the viability and advisability of his satire. Horace: "Some find my satire too hard and in fact actionable; others too soft" (*nimis acer et ultra legem*; *sine nervis*)—all sexual puns intended by the flaccid Flaccus (*S.* II.1.2, 18). Trebatius: "Just abandon satire and write instead an epic panegyric for your Caesar. You will earn rewards, not conflict."[45] Whether or not Horace dismisses Trebatius' counsel (he does), he plants the debate on the appropriate limits for satire in the minds of his readers and transfers their opinions about the propriety of satire into a legal context. This all may be manufactured, amusing mischief on Horace's part so that he can again defend the value of satire and pledge his allegiance, and, yet, the satirist can only have his fun at Trebatius' and his

[45] Cf. C. Trebatius Testa in Cicero's letters (*ad Familiares*; *PIR* 3.333, no. 228; Fraenkel, 1957: 145–147; Leeman, 1982: 159). Horace's satire confirms that Trebatius liked to swim (Cic. *Fam.* 7.10.2), enjoyed a good drinking-bout (*Fam.* 7.22), and possessed a keen literary mind (*Fam.* 7.6; 7.12; 7.16). Cicero ribs Trebatius for his unlimited ambition and how much pleasure he takes in the status and money that come with being the lawyer for the *imperator* Julius Caesar (*Fam.* 7.13.1). Trebatius experienced the imperial rewards that he is advising Horace to pursue. Trebatius thinks Horace is concerned that some consider his poetry libelous (*ultra / legem*, 1–2). Horace, however, is more concerned with the art of his satire, the aesthetic of invective, the serious and overdone versus the insipid and trite (Anderson, 1984: 35–42; G. Harrison, 1987: 49–52). Nevertheless, the muddled boundary between law, politics, and aesthetics, and their degree of interaction are among the primary tensions of the satire (Rudd, 1966: 130–131; Leeman, 1982: 160–162; 1983: 209–215; Muecke, 1995: 203–206; Lowrie, 2009b: 327–348). Horace uses the form of the *recusatio* to reject Trebatius' advice (*S.* II.1.12–20) and uses its irony to offset the notion that his satire may be impotent (Johnson, 2004b: 21–22).

own expense because he knows that society has standards for acceptable speech and that playing with and against those boundaries is precarious.

Under the influence of a narrow Archilochean reception, in particular since Horace permits in his criticism an ambivalence about the acceptability of abusive speech, it could be called a natural reflex to add him to the list of those censuring Archilochus for being overly aggressive, and to go further and think that Horatian iambic cannot convey sufficient spirit.[46] It is tempting to distance Horace's *Epodes* from its societal contexts and turn his iambics into an exercise in genre, more intellectual than emotive, in which he mollifies Archilochean iambic with a mild-mannered Callimacheanism, as Catullus says he tried to do but failed (c.116) and Ovid later claimed he did (*Ibis* 51–58).[47] Archilochean iambic of the Catullan variety may only achieve an ultimate resolution, if this is its goal at all, by empowering one side through destroying another. Social cohesion becomes reduced to domination. Resolution in this case is one-sided: it is forced compliance. Horace denies such a view of Archilochus that is wrapped up too tightly in the story of the Lykambids (*non res et agentia verba Lycamben*) and at the same time boasts that he brought to Rome not only Archilochus' meter but his essence (*numeros animosque secutus / Archilochi*). Horace's iambic criticism reanimates for Rome the whole of Archilochean poetry, its outer form (*numeros*) and its inner substance, its soul (*animos*). Horace does not oversimplify iambic either in his performance or criticism of it, and I have tried to choose my words carefully throughout this chapter to avoid equating Archilochus with the invective against Lykambes in order to explore how Horace finds this understanding of Archilochus too narrow to represent the whole of his (Archilochus' and Horace's) iambic. This is a case of "neither … nor." Horace is neither going soft, nor restricting the iambic spirit of Archilochus to abusive retaliation ("the lacerating bloody tooth").

---

[46] When S. Braund (2004: 418 n. 16) argues that the ambivalence satirists show about the acceptable boundaries of free speech is part of their program, she is careful to distinguish satire from Horace's iambic: "this [Horace's *Epodes* and other Latin iambic poetry] very different genre—an ancient genre with Greek antecedents, as opposed to a new-fangled Latin genre—would require a very different discussion." Yet, however distinct iambic and satire may be from each other, they are both discourses invested heavily in invective and also represent sympotic performative moments (*S.* I.4.86–93); see also Burckhardt, 1898–1902: [IV] 159; Rotstein, 2010: 165–166, 253–256.

[47] Again this approach does not do justice to either Archilochean or Callimachean iambic (see *supra*, A Personal Introduction). "Mannered" (highly stylized) is not the equivalent of "mild." Horace's first word in the *Epodes* (*ibis*) names Callimachus' *Ibis*, his most concentrated and sustained invective (see Chapter 2).

Another Side to Iambic

There is another side to iambic, one more associated with laughter and renewed understanding not pain and death. This other side plays a leading role in the formation of tragedy and comedy, as outlined by Aristotle. By Aristotle's account poets who would have been writers of lampoons—the iambic meter being the medium for blame poetry (ἐν οἷς κατὰ τὸ ἁρμόττον καὶ τὸ ἰαμβεῖον ἦλθε μέτρον—διὸ καὶ ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ τούτῳ ἰάμβιζον ἀλλήλους., Arist. *Poet.* 1448b30–32)—were predisposed to take up comedy, while those who would have written epic turned to tragedy:[48]

> παραφανείσης δὲ τῆς τραγῳδίας καὶ κωμῳδίας οἱ ἐφ' ἑκατέραν τὴν ποίησιν ὁρμῶντες κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν οἱ μὲν ἀντὶ τῶν ἰάμβων κωμῳδοποιοὶ ἐγένοντο, οἱ δὲ ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπῶν τραγῳδοδιδάσκαλοι, διὰ τὸ μείζω καὶ ἐντιμότερα τὰ σχήματα εἶναι ταῦτα ἐκείνων. (Arist. *Po.* 1449a2–6)
>
> Once tragedy and comedy came on the scene, each one took after these two types of poiēsis according to their natural bent: some became comic instead of iambic poets; others became producers of tragedies instead of epic poets, because these latter forms were greater and more estimable than the former.

The move from iambic to comedy and epic to tragedy is logical, since iambists knew how to exploit the base (ludicrous and laughable) side of human behavior and epicists the heroic. But also according to Aristotle's basic definitions for comedy and tragedy, comedy must not end in pain and disaster or the comic turns tragic:

> ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία ἐστὶν ὥσπερ εἴπομεν μίμησις φαυλοτέρων μέν, οὐ μέντοι κατὰ πᾶσαν κακίαν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ αἰσχροῦ ἐστι τὸ γελοῖον μόριον. τὸ γάρ γελοῖόν ἐστιν ἁμάρτημά τι καὶ αἶσχος ἀνώδυνον καὶ οὐ φθαρτικόν, οἷον εὐθὺς τὸ γελοῖον πρόσωπον αἰσχρόν τι καὶ διεστραμμένον ἄνευ ὀδύνης. (Arist. *Po.* 1449a32–37)
>
> Comedy is, as we said, the imitation of the baser, not however in respect to all vice, but the laughable is part of the shameful. For the laughable is a kind of mistake and ugliness but painless and not destructive, as for example the laughable mask is something ugly and distorted without pain.

---

[48] On *iambos* in Aristotle, see most recently Rotstein, 2010: 61–87, 108–111. It is trite but true to admit we miss Aristotle's theory of laughter (Janko, 1984). My best move is to recommend Rosen's work on the iambographic and satiric traditions (1988; 1995: 119–138; 2007; Sluiter and Rosen, 2004) and Halliwell specifically on Aristotle's poetics (1986; 1991; 2002; 2004: 115–144, 307–331).

This distinction between comedy and tragedy pinpoints a fundamental question about iambists and their turn to comedy. Epicists writing about the pain of warring would have an understanding of the fallen heroic character appropriate for tragedy. In the art of the epicist/tragedian there is some compatibility both in terms of content and outcome. The iambist/comic, on the other hand, if defined by the Lykambid tradition, would be familiar with the risible and shameful but would also be ready to use mockery to inflict suffering, resulting in a basic conflict between content and outcome. Yet pain cannot be part of Aristotle's comic equation. Socrates, when he stood trial for impiety and corrupting the Athenian youth, counted on this basic tenet being readily understood, that *aischrologia* in a comic context was not to be given such credence that it could cause actual harm for comedian, target, or audience. He protests that those maligning him could not be taken any more seriously than Aristophanes' comic caricature of him in the *Clouds* (Pl. *Ap.* 18–19b–c, 20c). His defense rests in part on the Athenian jurors associating all accusations against him with Aristophanic comic license and therefore dismissing the charges. Unfortunately the jury does not.[49] My point here is that, although *iambos* and Old Comedy are different modes of expression, they both permit unabashed laughter in expressions of blame and outrage[50] Would not poets with an penchant for iambic, especially if it is characterized largely as hunting down the person who wronged them (Archilochus/Lykambes), grow impatient with the constraints of comedy, specifically with the notion that its scurrility operates in a context where targets are ultimately safe—or prove poor comedians in the end by pushing lampoons too far so that the laughable turns tragic?

---

[49] Comic mockery ending in death is out of the ordinary (e.g., the comic poets in their envy tearing Euripides to pieces, *Vit.* 21; for an analysis of the basic evidence, see Compton, 2006: 139–140). Comedians, on the other hand, were harassed by those they attacked. It was said that Alcibiades threw Eupolis overboard and he drown (*PCG* 5.295, 332). Cleon may have taken Aristophanes before the boulē, although it did him no good. While the authenticity for such stories is suspect (Compton, 2006: 144–153), it is a safe assumption that Cleon, Cleisthenes, and Euripides did feel some impact from the abuse the comedians aimed at them (Ar. *Babylonians*; cf. *Ach.* 377–382; *Ra.* 426–429, 738–1460). Opinion splits over who damaged Socrates' reputation the most, Aristophanes or others attacking him. The guilty verdict against Socrates makes this question impossible to answer with certainty (see Halliwell's review of the argument, 2008: 255): the jurors may have thought Aristophanes' ridicule persuasive, irrelevant, or corroborating the charges to some extent.

[50] Compare Nagy (1999: 253–275), Rosen (2007: 208, n. 1), and Halliwell (2008: 243–263, 327–331).

Without insisting that Aristotle's account for the development of drama be granted authoritative status (although Horace relies on it strongly),[51] its logic fails only if we superimpose on it a narrow view of iambic. Archilochean iambic has another side, decidedly comic rather than tragic; that is, the story of the Lykambids is only one point of view. Other stories told about the origins and use of iambic reveal a predisposition for mockery / laughter leading to renewed understanding. If this other side of iambic is given full credit, Aristotle's iambist is as fit for comedy as the epicist is for tragedy.[52] The "Mockery of Demeter" (Hom. *h. Dem.* 192–205) is the more repeated story in recent studies of iambic.[53] To this should be added "Archilochus and His Cow" (Mnesiepes Inscription, *SEG* 15.517 A[E_1], col. 2).[54] In the Homeric *Hymn*, Demeter, grief-stricken over the loss of her daughter, travels the world searching for her missing child, whom Hades secreted off to be his bride. When she learns from Helios that none other than Zeus gave Persephone to Hades, the goddess enraged withdraws from the assembly of the gods, veils her divinity, and wanders earth's countryside in the guise of an old woman, trapped between her anger and lament. She does not eat or care for herself, so that her pain-filled mourning leaves her wasting away, only a

---

[51] See *infra*.

[52] See also the discussion of the *pharmakos* complex (Introduction). Ritual shaming in its most graphic form (human sacrifice, real or symbolic) has a positive end: cleansing the community and preserving its welfare. There are, however, other more comic vantage points within iambic that Horace can exploit.

[53] See Richardson (1974) and Foley (1994), two seminal commentaries on the *Hymn* with extensive bibliographies.

[54] The "Mockery of Demeter" is Rosen's title (2007: 47). Studies on iambic over the last ten years have started to retell the story of Iambe and Demeter. What motivates the repetition is a basic question on the definitions and relationships between myth, ritual, and reality: how precisely, if at all, does myth explain cultural practices, in this case the use of invective and the iambic idea; cf. Hooke, 1933: 3–5; Bascom, 1957: 103–114; Fontenrose, 1966; Kirk, 1970: 12–29; Burkert, 1972: 29–34; Vernant, 1974; Hardin, 1983: 846–862; Graf, 1985; Edmunds, 1990; Dowden, 1992; Bowie, 1993; Rotstein, 2010: 167–182. This requires a follow-up question on how the repetition of certain stories affects perceptions about a specific cultural practice. Retelling, a basic function of myth, is a highly selective process and has the potential to become determinative for interpreting custom, cultural or literary. I have chosen to use fabricated titles for the episodes and to keep them in story form so as not to force any one paradigm on a complex problem, and at least to allow reservations about whether or not the stories are a direct reflection of any supposed "iambic reality." It is enough for my argument to note how Horace tries to position himself in relation to Archilochus' reputation (also a product of retelling). Obviously by Horace's estimation the story of Lykambes had become more decisive for evaluating iambic than any other, and Horace can claim that another view is rightly Archilochean.

shadow of the divine. She happens near the house of Celeus, ruler of Eleusis, and his daughters bring Demeter to their mother Metanaira to serve as a nurse-maid for her royal infant son. As the goddess enters Celeus' house, she steps on the threshold (... ἡ δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' οὐδὸν ἔβη ποσὶ καί ῥα μελάθρου / κῦρε κάρη, πλῆσεν δὲ θύρας σέλαος θείοιο., 188–189). At that very moment of sacral transition her divine presence shines through and frightens Metanaira. The queen reverently welcomes the "old woman" and showing hospitality offers her own well-appointed chair to the goddess, but Demeter refuses to sit and remains silent, grieved. Then, the servant Iambe intervenes:

ἀλλ' ἀκέουσα ἔμιμνε κατ' ὄμματα καλὰ βαλοῦσα,
πρίν γ' ὅτε δή οἱ ἔθηκεν Ἰάμβη κέδν' εἰδυῖα
πηκτὸν ἕδος, καθύπερθε δ' ἐπ' ἀργύφεον βάλε κῶας.
ἔνθα καθεζομένη προκατέσχετο χερσὶ καλύπτρην·
δηρὸν δ' ἄφθογγος τετιημένη ἧστ' ἐπὶ δίφρου,
οὐδέ τιν' οὔτ' ἔπεϊ προσπτύσσετο οὔτε τι ἔργῳ,
ἀλλ' ἀγέλαστος ἄπαστος ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος
ἧστο πόθῳ μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρός,
πρίν γ' ὅτε δὴ χλεύῃς μιν Ἰάμβη κέδν' εἰδυῖα
πολλὰ παρασκώπτουσ' ἐτρέψατο πότνιαν ἁγνὴν
μειδῆσαι γελάσαι τε καὶ ἵλαον σχεῖν θυμόν·
ἣ δή οἱ καὶ ἔπειτα μεθύστερον εὔαδεν ὀργαῖς. (194–205)

She waited resistant, her lovely eyes cast down,
until knowing Iambe set out a well-built stool
for her and cast over it a silvery fleece.
Seated there, the goddess drew the veil before her face.
For a long time she sat voiceless with grief on the stool
and responded to no one with word or gesture.
Unsmiling, tasting neither food nor drink,
she sat wasting with desire for her deep-girt daughter,
until knowing Iambe jested with her and
mocking with many a joke moved the holy goddess
to smile and laugh and keep a gracious heart—
Iambe, who later pleased her moods as well.[55]

Immediately after her encounter with Iambe, Demeter accepts a barley-drink, ending her fast. She takes Metanaira's son, Demophoön, and holds him tenderly to her breast, a powerful symbol that Demeter through "Iambic" jest and laughter had found a way in her grief to begin recovering her role as earth's fertility goddess.

---

[55] I borrow Foley's (1994) translation.

"Archilochus and His Cow," although it is from an inscription located in the Archilocheion and therefore also within a ritual context, represents a very different dramatic setting and mood, less solemn with far less anxiety. Telesicles sends his young son Archilochus on an errand to sell a cow at a nearby market in the district of Leimones. On the way Archilochus crosses paths with a group of women returning from their work in the country, and he begins to joke at them. Far from being put off, the women return his jests and tell him that if the cow is for sale they will buy it for a good price. Archilochus has no time to respond. The women vanish, the cow disappears, and he finds a lyre in its place. Archilochus is caught in a difficult but amusing predicament: the boy must return to his father and somehow explain why he traded his family's income away for a "guitar." Even though Archilochus tells his father that the women must have been the Muses and the whole situation mysteriously supernatural, Telesicles searches the entire island of Paros for the cow anyway with no luck. The father does not give up. When he is chosen to represent his fellow-citizens to the oracle of Delphi on another matter, he inquires after the cow. The Oracle responds: "When you return to your homeland the first son to greet you will be famous for his song." Telesicles reaches Paros during a festival, and Archilochus is the first son to speak to his father.

These two stories are not usually told one after the other. The humor in "Archilochus and His Cow" is too obvious and it lacks the somber and religious overtones that the presence of a grieving mother-goddess provides. Nevertheless, the two reach the climactic moment in their plots by the same action: jesting. Like most good stories, these tales leave gaps to be filled in by the audience's imagination. We are not told precisely what jokes Iambe made for Demeter or the specifics of Archilochus' lampoons against the Muses.[56] Both accounts suggest that what Iambe and Archilochus said contained sexual scurrility. Although it is an open question whether or not Iambe's jests were aimed directly at Demeter, χλεύῃς paired with πολλὰ παρὰ σκώπτουσ' suggests a degree of impertinence (vv.202–204).[57] Also when in other versions of

[56] Clay (1984: 34–35) covers the various guesses. She thinks Demeter, sitting in the chair given her by Iambe, reminds the old servant of a birthing stool. Clay imagines then that Iambe's joke plays on the implausibility of such an old woman being a new mother. This is very logical, but still conjecture. We have plenty of evidence for women engaging in mockery but very little of the actual content (cf. O'Higgins, 2001: 148–149).

[57] Halliwell (2008: 18–19, 34 n.86) compares lexicographic connotations with actual usage and concludes that σκώπτειν is not always malicious, but also that "*Chleu-* terms

the myth the part of Iambe is played by Baubo, who cheers Demeter by exposing herself, it is hard to ignore completely the sexual overtones in ὀργαῖς ("Iambe, who later 'gratified her impulse' as well," ἣ δή οἱ καὶ ἔπειτα μεθύστερον εὔαδεν ὀργαῖς, v.205).[58] It is clear that Archilochus mocked the women he met (νομίσαντα δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ἀπιέναι αὐτὰς εἰς πόλιν *προσελθόντα σκώπτειν*) and that he was surprised when they reacted by laughing and joining in his fun for their own pleasure.[59] However divergent these stories may be, therefore, in time and circumstance they both portray jesting and mockery as a means of bringing together divided worlds: the human to divine, son to father, mother to daughter, and master to slave.

The meeting between Iambe and Demeter was encoded into the rites of initiation for the Eleusinian Mysteries and the worship of the goddess (Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.12.2).[60] Like Demeter the initiates kept silence, fasted, sat veiled and positioned on a ram's skin, and drank the *kykeôn*, water mixed with barley and other herbs, sacred to Demeter (Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.21.2).[61] The character of Iambe personifies the practice of

---

denote strong, often *risqué*, derision." Since both terms appear in this context, I imagine that Iambe did mock Demeter but her intent was not malicious. She may have expected the other old woman (Demeter) to respond in kind; cf. the ritual in honor of Apollo Aegletes in which women and men bantered back and forth (τὰς δ' αἰσχροῖς ἥρωες ἐπιστοβέεσκον ἔπεσσιν / *χλεύῃ* γηθόσυνοι· γλυκερὴ δ' ἀνεδαίετο μέσσῳ / κερτομίη καὶ νεῖκος ἐπεσβόλον. ἐκ δέ νυ κείνης / μολπῆς ἡρωῶν νήσῳ ἔνι τοῖα *γυναῖκες / ἀνδράσι δηριόωνται*, ὅτ' Ἀπόλλωνα θυηλαῖς / Αἰγλήτην Ἀνάφης τιμήορον ἱλάσκωνται., Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 4.1725–1730; Call. *Aet.* fr. 21 Pf; ἀντιτωθάζειν, Conon *Dieg.* ch. 49 = *FGrH* 26 F1).

[58] For other versions of the Demeter myth and Baubo, see Foley, 1994: 46, 97–103; also on Baubo: Olender, 1985; Richardson, 1974: 215–217; Arthur, 1977: 20–21; O'Higgins, 2001: 139–142; 2003: 37–57; Bonfante, 2009: 158–170; Rotstein, 2010: 116–124. Ὀργή in archaic poetry is more frequent for animals and signifies their overall demeanor or temperament. Here it prevents the repetition of θυμός. Richardson (1974: 223) proposes the rather proper "spirit" and Foley translates (1994) "moods"; compare with Newman's (1998: 103, n.9) potential innuendoes (ὀργάω, "to swell with new life;" Ὀργάς, "the rich land sacred to the goddesses of Eleusis;" "orgasm?"). Newman concludes, "The translation must accommodate Baubo's displays." "Gratified her impulse" is my attempt.

[59] For a full accounting of antiphonal ritual ridicule, see Halliwell (2008: 193–195).

[60] Scullion (2007: 197–198) warns against relying too heavily on aetiological myth. In this case there are other corroborative sources; still, the *Hymn* is not an exact program for the rituals (Clinton, 1992: 13–14, 28–38; 2007: 344–346, privileges artistic representations). Reviews of the Demetrian rites can be found in Kerényi, 1941: 101–155; Mylonas, 1961; Burkert, 1972: 248–298; 1977: 285–289; 1987; Graf, 1974; Richardson, 1974: 12–30, 213–218; Clinton, 1993: 116–119; Foley, 1994: 37, 45–48, 65–75; Brown, 1997:16–42.

[61] Cf. the purification and initiation of Herakles shown on the Lovatelli urn and the Torre Nove sarcophagus. The Christian Clement counts as a hostile witness. The κυκεών was known as a magical elixir with a variety of applications, ranging from treating battle

ritual mockery, αἰσχρολογία, which was an integral part of the Mysteries and other fertility festivals (Call. fr. 21 Pf.; D.S. 5.4.7; Apollod. *Bibliotheca* 1.5.1; Cleom. 2.1; cf. Ov. *Fasti* 3.675–696).[62] As the sacred procession made its way from Athens to Eleusis, at the crossing of the Athenian Cephisus, a veiled figure, sitting on the bridge, hurled insults at those in the parade (Str. 9.1.24; Hsch. s.v. γεφυρίς, γεφυρισταί). Along the way, women sitting in carriages threw out similar abusive jests (schol. ad Ar. *Pl.* 1014; *Suda* τ19, s.v. τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἁμαξῶν σκώμματα).[63] When the procession reached Eleusis, the women spent the night singing and dancing, the παννυχίς, which incorporated αἰσχρολογία. The ritual finds its way into comedy. Aristophanes' chorus of initiates sings in iambic rhythms the erotic Iacchus song and then aims its mockery at political figures (*Ra.* 391–459). Before the chorus begins, it prays that its jesting will be worthy of Demeter's festival (τῆς σῆς ἑορτῆς ἀξίως παίσαντα καὶ σκώψαντα, *Ra.* 391–392). Given the presence of "the iambic" and its use in rituals, it follows as a natural consequence of his iambic that Archilochus could be associated with the cults of Demeter and Dionysus and that his song likewise could be perceived as embodying the ritual use of mockery,[64] to expose differences between one reality and another so

---

fatigue (Hom. *Il.* 11.624) to sexual desire (Ar. *Pax* 712); see Richardson, 1974: 344–348; Foley, 1994: 47. Demeter's κυκεών did not contain wine and no conclusive evidence exists that the drink was fermented. It was a drink best suited for breaking a fast.

62 Obscene jesting is a common ritual act shared by the Demetrian festivals (besides the Eleusinian Mysteries: the Stēnia, the Thesmophoria, and the Haloa; for descriptions see, Richardson, 1974: 213–216; O'Higgins, 2001: 142–148, 2003: 15–36; Halliwell, 2008: 155–205). As the citations given indicate, there are more witnesses for the Thesmophoria, a fall festival to consecrate the field for planting. Its rituals included seclusion, fasting, drinking the *kykeôn*, and *aischrologia*.

63 Burkert (1972: 229 n.18) assigns the abuse from the carriages to the Choes ritual, the chief day of the Anthesteria. There is some question whether the narrow bridge over the Rheitoi would admit carriages (Burkert, 1972: 278 n.19; Richardson, 1974: 214 n.2).

64 Archilochus' homeland of Paros was a prominent cult center for Demeter (see Richardson, 1974: 321, v.491: St. Byz. s.v. Πάρος; Apollod. *FGrH* 244 F89), and it may have been the case that his family had priestly ties to her cult. Polygnotus' painting of Hades from the Cnidian Lesche at Delphi portrays Tellis, Archilochus' grandfather, traveling in Charon's boat on the way to the underworld in the company of Cleoboea, a priestess of Demeter who brought her rites from Paros to Thasos (Paus. 10.28.3). Archilochus' Ἰόβακχοι contain a fragment of a cult song for Demeter (Δήμητρος ἁγνῆς καὶ Κόρης / τὴν πανήγυριν σέβων., fr. 322 W). I am not concerned here with whether the Ἰόβακχοι could be authentic (West places frr. 322–323 with the *spuria*; cf. Brown, 1997: 45, n.12 and 46–49)—fr. 322 is likely not Archilochean, given the anomaly in its iambic dimeter that breaks Porson's law—but with the instinct to assign the song to Archilochus and identify his iambic with ritual (Reckford, 1987: 480–481; Miller, 1994: 24–28). The Ἰόβακχοι point directly to Dionysus, and fr. 120 W (ὡς Διωνύσου

as to promote new insight and understanding between them.[65] And yet, as often is the case, tragedy ends up the weightier mode, and the deadly account of iambic (the Lykambids) proves more graphic and memorable for the reception of iambus and Archilochus than these, by comparison, other ritual/comic perspectives.

Horace disavows the Lykambid tradition, but nowhere makes direct reference to these two stories. Given that, is it possible to determine how much Horace knew about the use of mockery in religious ritual or the comic associations surrounding the origins and practices of iambic? In addition to the ritual context that Horace would have encountered in his models (reviewed in the Introduction),[66] two other instances, one in

---

ἄνακτος καλὸν ἐξάρξαι μέλος/οἶδα διθύραμβον οἴνωι συγκεραυνωθεὶς φρένας.) places Archilochus' performance of the Dionysian dithyramb on more solid footing. The Mnesiepes Inscription (*SEG* 15.517 A[E$_1$], col. 3) is too fragmentary to determine that Archilochus performed his "too iambic" song (ἰαμβικώτερον) at a festival for Dionysus, although this seems the best guess (Οἰφολίωι, v.35). No defined ritual context survives for fr. 215 W, but it does set *iambi* in opposition to mourning (καὶ μ' οὔτ' ἰάμβων οὔτε τερπωλέων μέλει). Hipponax fr. 39 tantalizes by suggesting that the speaker will recover from his suffering by drinking the *kykeôn*. As I mentioned in "A Personal Introduction," such connections between literary iambic and ritual are too few to prevent a healthy skepticism over how the one relates to the other, but the early reception of archaic literary iambic and in particular the biographical tradition on Archilochus—fragments aside—are not so skeptical. If Archilochean iambic was taken to be "secular," the witnesses would have had little motive for protesting about the "foul-mouthed" Archilochus being considered sacrosanct. Compare Bowie (2001:1–3) with O'Higgins (2003: 60–62).

[65] The rites, including obscene jesting and mockery, caused initiates to experience the Mysteries so that they were transformed in their mind (Arist. fr. 15 R, Synesius Dion 10.48a); see Burkert, 1972: 268, 294–296; 1977: 289–290; Richardson, 1974: 216–217; O'Higgins, 2001: 159–160; Halliwell, 2008: 155–214, in particular his definition for ritual laughter, 357–358. Accordingly J.K. Newman translates the mythic episode of Demeter and Iambe back into ritual: "In its beginnings, therefore, the iambic was derived from the ritual, threshold provocation of laughter in the face of mourning and death, intended in its turn to precede resurrection from the lower world, and whether this is historically true or not, what matters is that this was how the genre was perceived" (1998: 101–102; also 1990: 43–74; cf. Miller, 1994: 25). Halliwell (2008: 164) delineates a process for ritual laughter that includes transgression, responsion, and fusion: "It is Iambe's mirth that triggers Demeter's laughter: a human act instigates the process, impinges on the divine, and is answered with propitiousness that will translate itself into benefits for humankind in general. In other words, laughter *binds* the human (*qua* worshipper) and the divine (*qua* bestower of fertility and prosperity) . . .".

[66] These include Horace's *Hymn to Mercury* and its close rendering of the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*, when the god invents the lyre and makes the strings resound like the responsive lampoons (ἐπὶ δὲ ζυγὸν ἤραρεν ἀμφοῖν,/ἑπτὰ δὲ *συμφώνους* ὀΐων ἐτανύσσατο χορδάς./ . . . ἣ δ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς σμερδαλέον *κονάβησε*, 51–54; cf. Horace's *Hymn to Hermes*, *C.* III.11.3–4: *tuque, testudo,* ***resonare*** *septem/callida nervis*). This interplay strongly suggests that Horace knew the lyre's association with iambic exchanges

the *Satires* and one in the *Epodes*, indicate he knew more rather than less. When the satirist Horace traded the city for the country so that he could have some peace to write, he packed with him for his trip the full range of Greek comedy: Eupolis (Old Comedy); Plato (Middle); Menander (New)—and Archilochus (*S.* II.3.11–12).[67] Unfortunately for Horace his writer's-block did not subside because he moved out of the city, and his antagonist Damasippus rehearses the contents of Horace's book-stash only to scoff at the satirist's misery. Damisippus understands the satiric game. He is puzzled that a satirist would leave Rome in the first place during the Saturnalia, a festival featuring prominent cultural inversions.[68] A satirist who abandons Rome on the Saturnalia and packs Archilochus and the comedians off to the country is leaving at the wrong time and running away from who he is. Damisippus decides that Horace must be in too serious a mood to make good on his promise to write some satire (… *at ipsis / Saturnalibus huc fugisti sobrius. ergo / dic aliquid*

at festivals, and the correlation of musical (strings) and human responsion (lampoons). Further, in this case, an argument from silence is compelling. Halliwell, 2008: 159–160, cites five primary texts in support of a Greek concept for ritual laughter (Pl. *Lg.* 637a–b; Arist. *Pol.* 1336b16–19; Call. *Aet.* fr.21.9–10 Pf.; Plu. *Mor.* 361b, 417c; Iamb. *Myst.* 1.11). These five cover a span of about eight centuries, including Greece under Roman rule. It is hard to imagine that an author as familiar as Horace was with Greek literature and custom would not have known about this particular Greek paradigm.

[67] Horace was willing for all the differences between Old Comedy and his *Satires / Iambi* (most noticeably meter and dramatic form) to acknowledge his debt to the comedians (*S.* I.4). Horace's association of these disparate forms and his packing up Archilochus along with the comedians imply that he was concerned not so much with agreement in technical aspects as with what he, a satirist / iambist, could learn from the comedians about how to sport with blame (Rosen, 2007: 209). Horace knew well Archilochean metrics, and likely he learned from him (and Hipponax, Semonides, Callimachus, not to mention the comedians and others we may be missing or overlooking) equally well how he could remake the iambic idea for Rome (cf. Halliwell, 2008: 206–214: "Is Old Comedy a form of ritual laughter?").

[68] E.g., the Lord of Misrule, *Saturnalicius princeps*, Sen. *Apocol.* 8.2; slaves had time off, Cic. *Leg.* 2.29, Macr. *Sat.* 1.7.18, 22–23 (cf. Archilochus as the trickster in Pòrtulas, Miralles and Pòrtulas, 1983: 11–50). Graf (2005: 192): "Satire is about blame and about masks. Performance, ritual or other, is not far away." Graf cautions against the attempt to associate Roman satire with specific festivals, in particular the Saturnalia. He finds no evidence that the Saturnalia and its customs gave rise to any literary genre featuring invective. This disconnect may prove the point. I would argue that Horace is creating a specific ritual context for satire out of an impulse he takes from his Greek models (cf. Mart. 1. proem. 16: Martial writes his epigrams for those attending the Florales). Martial also justifies his obscene jests by associating them with the Saturnalia (4.14; 5.30; 10.18; 11.2; 15; 13.1; 14.1), and so Spisak (2007: 27) speculates that Martial is "consciously or not" imitating the iambic tradition. Seneca may have written the *Apocolocyntosis* to be read at the Saturnalia (Nauta, 1987: 69–96).

dignum promissis: incipe. nil est., vv.4–6). The whole of this satire is seriocomic repartee based largely on the pretense that Horace does not know what he should, that the festival is a most appropriate occasion for mockery.[69] There is no writer's block in the sexual anxieties of epode 12. Here the male and female iambists, matching each other word for word, end up at odds with each other and frustrated with themselves: he imagines that his invective will shame and silence her, which it does not (v.13); she answers in kind, but is surprised when her invective ruins her seduction and frightens him away (vv.25–26). He is operating within the Lykambid tradition; she more like the Muses with Archilochus. The tension developed in both of these poems reveal an artist familiar with the festive and comic associations of iambic.

"But what are the precise roles in Horace for invective? Couldn't he associate his iambic with ritual and comedy and still be a partisan moralist, who happens to be amusing rather than deadly?" Like Plautus and Catullus, the Horatian iambist would entertain, while he communicates and enforces normative societal structures and values by allowing their opposites to control the dramatic plot:

> The point of this sort of inversion is to re-affirm and strengthen the traditional structures of society and even the natural world. Normality is reinforced by experiencing its opposite. (C. Brown, 1997: 41)[70]

---

[69] Compare Calvus' joke on Catullus (c.14). Calvus gives Catullus a book of bad poetry on the Saturnalia, the best of all days (*optimo dierum*, v.15). The mockery turns murderous when Catullus promises to punish Calvus by sending back to him the likes of Caesius, Aquinus, and Suffenus, every bit of literary poison he can set his hands on (*omnia colligam venena, / ac te his suppliciis remunerabor*, vv.19b–20).

[70] The bibliography on inversion in religious ritual is extensive. Brown (1997: 13–42) provides a convenient overview: the seminal works being Graf (1974) and Burkert (1972; 1977; 1979); also Abrahams and Bauman (1972: 193–208); Winkler (1990: 140, 198–206); Cole (1993: 25–38); Zeitlin (1996: 375–416). Segal (1968) uses the concept as his primary interpretive matrix for Plautine comedy, and Wray (2001) for Catullan iambic. The concern I have in applying inversion to Horatian iambic is that not enough credit is given to the practice of iambic and its associations with ritual laughter as an impetus for societal transformation and change. Iambic instead becomes primarily a policing mechanism, a paradigm for stasis. Bakhtin's "carnivalesque" could provide an important corrective (see Bakhtin, 1965; Seidel, 1979; Rösler, 1986: 25–44; Edwards, 1993: 89–117; von Möllendorf, 1995; Emerson, 1999: "Carnival," 237–282; Branham, 2005: 121–122). For Bakhtin the celebrative suspension of societal norms involved a rebirth of the community, that is a passing away of the old and transformation to the new (Emerson, 2002: 5–26; Halliwell, 2008: 204–206). This ritual paradigm (death to life) represents a rejuvenation that is more than a return to familiar standards (cf. Carrière, 1979). My personal thanks to Allen Miller for calling my attention to this point in Bakhtin's thought. Miller (1998: 257–259) contends that too often the application of the carnivalesque is "cavalier."

If we were to apply the principle of inversion in this way to Horace's iambic, we might conclude that he attempts to re-affirm the rule of peace by parading Rome's propensity for civil war. He tries to reinforce class standards by empowering the upstart slave, the witch, and the oversexed woman.[71] Horace's iambic within this paradigm aims at ironic indignation and could remain purely partisan.

Such a characterization could be better justified for Horace's iambic, if he presented the *Epodes* as a moralizing fiction or reduced it to generalities. The *Epodes* is not so artificial. Horace places the task of iambic within a very different social circumstance, when rage and its words are normative rather than ironic. Romans go to war against each other by natural inclination and instinct (epodes 7, 16); Prometheus places the violence of the lion in human hearts, when he creates them (*C.* I.16.13–16); the anticipated response to injury is enraged cursing and retaliation (epodes 5, 6, 8, 10, 12); honoring one's obligations means going off to war (epode 1); and Canidia is too dangerous to dismiss with a fart and a laugh (*S.* I.8.46–50; epodes 5, 17). The Rome of Horace's *Epodes* is in real crisis, its social state fragmented. Horatian iambic stands Rome right on the threshold, an undefined space neither properly inside nor outside, and consequently full of the possibility for new beginnings or catastrophe if a wrong move is made.[72] Metanaira was right, when Demeter tread on her threshold, to be frightened and awe-struck, even expectant.

Even if iambic's ritual affinity is set aside as secondary, Horace's appraisal on the utility of iambic at *Ars* 79–81 in itself indicates both that he recognized iambic's association with invective (*Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo*, 79; ἐν οἷς κατὰ τὸ ἁρμόττον καὶ τὸ ἰαμβεῖον ἦλθε μέτρον—διὸ καὶ ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ τούτῳ ἰάμβιζον ἀλλήλους, Arist. *Po.* 1448b30–32) and appreciated the specific role that iambic played in drama, comedy and tragedy together (*hunc socci*

Bakhtin differentiated between carnival and satiric laughter: "The joyful, open, festive laughter. The closed, purely negative satirical laughter. This is not a laughing laugh. The Gogolian laugh is joyful" (1979: 135; also 1965: 28–29, 37–39, 81, 114, 211). Therefore, I suggest that Horace's overall iambic praxis, in that it contains a regenerative force, would not be "closed and purely negative;" cf. Miller (275–276) on *S.* II.7 and 8.

[71] Cf. Mankin, 1995: 8–9.

[72] Consider Troy's fate when the wooden horse pauses on her threshold (… *quater ipso in limine portae / substitit*, Verg. *A.* 2.242–243a; the stuttering *-stitit* imitates the rumbling of the horse bouncing on the threshold). Creusa grabs hold of Aeneas at the door and clings to the threshold, begging him not to return to battle (*ecce autem complexa pedes in limine coniunx / haerebat parvumque patri tendebat Iulum*, *A.* 2.673–674). Troy and the noble matron fall at the threshold.

cepere pedem grandesque cothurni, *Ars* 80).[73] Iambic rhythm is useful in either dramatic type because it is suited for responsion, when actors enter into dialogue, conversing back and forth with each other (*alternis aptum sermonibus*, 81a; cf. Arist. *Po.* 1448b32, ὅτι ἐν τῷ μέτρῳ τούτῳ ἰάμβιζον *ἀλλήλους*; 1449a24–27, πλεῖστα γὰρ ἰαμβεῖα *λέγομεν ἐν τῇ διαλέκτῳ τῇ πρὸς ἀλλήλους*). Iambic, a natural rhythm for speech,[74] bridges the physical distance between actors and audience, since it rises above crowd noise (*popularis / vincentem strepitus*, *Ars* 81b–82a) and complements action (*et natum rebus agendis*, *Ars* 82b; Arist. *Po.* 1459b37–1460a1, τὸ δὲ ἰαμβεῖον καὶ τετράμετρον κινητικὰ καὶ τὸ μὲν ὀρχηστικὸν τὸ δὲ πρακτικόν).[75]

Horace with this brief review, which depends heavily on Aristotle's account, provides an interpretive strategy for his own *iambos*. When Horace creates within the *Epodes* a movement that balances iambic moments, for example between aggression / resistance (such as, the patron and poet, epodes 2, 3, 14; the old and new nobility, epode 4; the boy and Canidia, epode 5; female and male, epodes 8, 12; the elegiac and iambic lover, epodes 11, 14; the poet and Canidia, epode 17), he aligns his iambic with its archaic and dramatic ancestry. His recreation of Parian iambic in a Roman context is not just a borrowing of Archilochean meters, although he accomplishes this skillfully. He associates the iambic meter with social dynamics: the strength of iambic to effect a dialogue and to manage the interactions of actors and audience so that the voices/sounds inside the theater do not drown each other out and so impede the drama. He in effect maps iambic onto his *Epodes* on a broad scale so that it involves theme and arrangement, that is, his iambic depends on and values diverse, often opposing, voices. His *Epodes* and his transition to the *Odes* replicate a social *krisis* in which persons struggle with each other, and sometimes with themselves, over how or even whether to push through the limits separating them. Through the struggle will emerge a type of iambic, a reciprocal song, which discounts an

---

[73] The Romans also designated genre by assigning authoritative names to particular forms (Harrison, 2007b: 5–6), and so Archilochus by name signifies iambic. How Archilochus in particular performed iambic becomes prescriptive for the genre.

[74] Arist. *Rh.* 1408b33–34; Cic. *Or.* 56.189; 57.192; Quint. 9.4.76.

[75] The source on iambic's power to handle competing noise is harder to determine. Schütz (1883: ad loc.), repeated by Wickham (1891: ad loc.), cites Cicero on the strong beat and speed of iambic and trochaic verse: *Nam cum sint numeri plures, iambum et trochaeum frequentem segregat ab oratore Aristoteles, Catule, vester, qui natura tamen incurrunt ipsi in orationem sermonemque nostrum; sed sunt insignes percussiones eorum numerorum et minuti pedes* (*de Or.* 3.182.3–8).

against-you mindset (domination) by depending on a diversified but unified plurality (with-you).[76] The result is an iambic capable of constructing a unity out of competing perspectives (μέθεξις; συμπλοκή), which would be a turn away from a warring mindset exemplified in the civil wars. To translate Parian iambic to Rome Horace will take the Lykambid tradition that iambic must be retaliatory vengeance on a journey from the first word, *ibis*, "You will go" (epode 1.1) to the last, *exitus*, "going away" (epode 17.81): *non res et agentia verba Lycamben*.[77] Whatever conclusion we reach about the efficacy of Horace's iambic project, at least we should consider his *Epodes* in light of the claim that Parian / Archilochean iambic and its praxis is misconceived when it is reduced to a mentality of divide and dominate.

[76] Much of iambic insult exploits stereotypical views of male dominance/female weakness. Literary iambists from classical to modern times are overwhelmingly male. When the male iambist/abuser gives voice to a female character, s/he often reflects back masculine norms (*infra*, Chapter 3; n.b. epodes 8 and 12). Worman (2008:43) cautions, "The difficulty comes, however, in the fact that no genuine female iambic voice is extant." O'Higgins (2003: 86–97) covers the topic well in her chapter, "Women's Iambic Voices." The surviving evidence for the female iambist is too slim to allow much more than O'Higgins' suggestion that Horace called Sappho *mascula* (*Epist.* I.19.28), because she took part in a male-dominated genre (see *supra*). It is fair to say, though, that the iambic idea attempts to cross such divisions. The story of Archilochus and his cow finds its appeal in the Muses, a learned female audience who know exactly how to respond to Archilochus. Iambe and Demeter are women from two different worlds. Demeter comes in beggarly disguise, but the bawdy servant woman Iambe sees beyond appearances ("knowing Iambe," Ἰάμβη … εἰδυῖα, Hom. *h. Dem.* 195, 202). The Eleusinian ritual of "bridge abuse" (γεφυρισμός) could have been performed by women and/or men in masks. Even if the "female" abuser talks like a man, it is worth considering how the act of placing "the male" into the female body might in effect *trans*gender the genre (cf. Martin, 2001: 73–74; O'Higgins, 2003: 58–85; Worman, 2008: 3–8, 18, 43–44, n.b. n.10).

[77] Can Horace's iambic be distinguished from or associated with "gangsta" rap, because his lyre overcomes division through the mutuality achieved in the shared experience of song (epode 13.17–18; *C.* I.16.25–28; 17.13–24; III. 28.9–16; IV.11.31–36; IV.12.9–28; see *infra* Chapter 4; cf. Rosen and Marks, 1999: 897–928; Rosen and Baines, 2002: 103–127)? I am an outsider, but I doubt that most rap artists would view Horace's resolution as anything other than disingenuous fantasy.

CHAPTER TWO

SOCIETY, IAMBIC RAGE, AND SELF-DESTRUCTION (EPODES 1–7)

The first of the *Epodes* feature an iambic marching off to war. "Rage armed Archilochus with the iamb, the appropriate meter" (*Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo*, *Ars* 79). This warring mentality gains momentum through the first seven epodes until rage and its invective infect all levels of Roman society, so that individuals are in conflict within themselves and Romans battle against each other. No one is satisfied; everyone violated.[1] There will be lighter moments, but overall these will be dominated by an iambic that announces a fragmented society. This is the time for Horace's iambic.

Complicating Loyalties (Epodes 1–4)

Horace starts by complicating friendship. Epode 1 gives no indication that his loyalty for Maecenas is anything but genuine, and that is the problem.[2] If Horace's "friendly" (*amice*) first address to Maecenas poises his iambs "on the brink of the battle of Actium,"[3] then it also balances Actium on the edge of each person's own patronage: civil conflict played out because of social obligations:

> Ibis Liburnis inter alta navium,
>   amice, propugnacula,

[1] Compare Girard's (1972: 49–57) sacrificial crisis, which precipitates tragedy: "As in Greek tragedy and primitive religion, it is not the differences but the loss of them that gives rise to violence and chaos …" (51). In Horace's *iambi*, Rome's internal crisis grows out of twin killing twin (epode 7), the ultimate symbol for a crisis of distinctions and the menace non-differentiation engenders (Girard: 57–67).

[2] Horace represents his decision to follow Maecenas as a conscious choice (*quid nos*, v.5), which is an essential ingredient in the ancient conception of friendship (cf. Cic. *Am.*).

[3] So Oliensis (1998: 64) begins her chapter, "Making faces at the mirror: the *Epodes* and the civil war." Barchiesi (2001: 141), while also quoting Oliensis, designates the *Epodes* "civil-war poetry." He warns against interpretations that artificially divide political from private poems.

paratus omne Caesaris periculum
subire, Maecenas, tuo.
quid nos, quibus te vita si superstite
iucunda, si contra, gravis?

roges tuum labore quid iuvem meo
imbellis ac firmus parum:
comes minore sum futurus in metu,
qui maior absentis habet,
ut adsidens inplumibus pullis avis
serpentium allapsus timet
magis relictis, non, ut adsit, auxili
latura plus praesentibus.
libenter hoc et omne militabitur
bellum in tuae spem gratiae, (epode 1.1–6, 15–24)

Go you will, friend, on Liburnian galleys among ship-towers, ready, Maecenas, to match Caesar's every danger with your own. What about me, whose life is worth living only if you survive, otherwise burdensome?

Perhaps you ask how any labor of mine might help yours, since I am passive and weak? At least as your companion I will suffer less fear, since with separation fear grows, as a bird, devoted to her fledgling chicks, fears the slippery serpent sliding near more when she has to leave her brood, even though when right there with them her help avails no more. Gladly will I fight this and every war to earn your favor.

Horace is a genius at first words, and *ibis* sets the mood and problem for the poem and the entire collection—*Sturm und Drang*.[4] Horace does not open with safe anonymity. He cuts loose with a second person address to his friend and patron, which heads Maecenas straight into war. "You will fight, because Caesar is going to war; and because you will go, I

[4] Horace's first words often encapsulate the whole. *Ibis*, epode 1 ("You will go"), introduces a song that announces a voyage to Actium, travels to the ends of the earth when the poet declares that he will follow Maecenas anywhere, journeys back from war to Horace's country retreat, and ends in the world of comedy. The movement of the whole, from warring to laughter, epitomizes the tensions conveyed in Horace's iambic praxis. Note also *qui fit*, *S.* I.1 ("how does it happen that"): the question sets the tenor for all of Horatian satire, which lampoons people for their lack of common sense in every day living; *omnibus hoc vitium*, *S.* I.3 ("everyone has this fault"): a critique on the Stoic principle that all sins are equal; *lupis et agnis*, epode 4 ("wolves and lambs"): class conflict over the success of an upstart slave; *mollis inertia*, epode 14 ("effeminate idleness"): Horace is too love-sick to finish his iambics for Maecenas; *altera*, epode 16 ("second"): a second rant against the destruction civil war brings to another generation; *parcius*, *C.* I.25 ("more infrequently"): a curse on Lydia who is losing her sex appeal, which she should realize since fewer lovers are calling at her door; *intactis*, *C.* III.24 ("untouched"): the damning nature of money and greed, both better left alone.

should follow too." Horace teaches his audience immediately that iambic depends on the *ego-tu* relationship and the demands it places on those involved.[5] *Ibis* also conveniently names by title Callimachus' most sustained hostile invective, and any iambist, writing in Archilochean iambic meter, who claims that particular Callimachean title, raises expectations that he will write with vitriolic passion.[6]

In some ways this epode cheats the expectations set with its first word by being a typical beginning for a collection.[7] It introduces an appropriate meter, and thus implies possible generic characteristics, reinforced through the image of the swift galley as opposed to the slow grand ships. This will not be high, slow-moving poetry. The opening four lines contain the customary acknowledgements to the patron with gratitude and the appropriate deference. Such geniality and respect may not seem to fit in with a poem of attack like Callimachus' *Ibis*, but Horace is actually reanimating Callimachus by relating him to Archilochus. Horace is placing Callimachus into a warring and Archilochean context in which friendship and loyalty, who is part of the group and who is not, is determined by their usefulness in fighting (Maecenas) and writing (Horace).[8] There is a real possibility that neither poet nor patron will measure up to their task, and if they do not, they may end up separated, or even if they do, their devotion to each other may not be enough to see them through the peril. As Horace tells Maecenas, "a mother bird wants to be with her fledglings, although her presence will not ward off the snake" (vv.21–22).

The threat in this iambic emerges as the *con*/geniality of the song's argument evolves. Horace progressively pushes his patron-reader, Maecenas, to acknowledge the menace inherent in their loyalties. The two parallel addresses to Maecenas (v.1 and v.15) at the beginning and near

---

[5] The entirety of the *Epodes*, even when the third person controls the narrative, builds off a first- to second-person construct: for example, Alfius as narrator (epode 2) and the exchange between Canidia and her victim (epode 5).

[6] See Heyworth (1993: 86). *Ibis* invokes the motif of the literary journey, and therefore prompts the reader to interpret the *Epodes* in a holistic fashion; on *Ibis* as a metapoetic reference to beginning a book of poems, see Holzberg (2002: 141).

[7] See also Mankin (1995: 49) on the propriety of epode 1 as an introduction to the collection.

[8] Mankin, 1995: 49, notes that camaraderie and loyalty in war is of significant interest to Archilochus. He cites the "military expeditions" (frr. 88–114 W) and in particular fr. 15 W (Γλαῦκ', ἐπίκουρος ἀνὴρ τόσσον φίλος ἔσκε μάχηται); cf. Arist. *E.E.* 7.1236a33–34. As well as Horace knows his Aristotle, I wonder if Horace also knows the context in which Aristotle cites this proverb, and so is questioning the value of a friendship based solely on utility.

mid-point in the poem place the poet and Maecenas in equally uncomfortable positions. Maecenas will have to fight bravely, while outmatched by towering ships, if he wants to match Caesar's dangers. The poet, on the other hand, (the pivotal transition *quid nos*, v.5, insists that he not be left out of the equation) must endure the possibility of permanent separation from his patron Maecenas. Maecenas and Horace together must fulfill their respective roles placed on them by their superiors with the prospect of not surviving the dangers at hand.[9] The menace for both increases with the second address (*roges tuum labore quid iuvem meo / imbellis ac firmus parum*, 15–16). Horace puts his "small voice" ('I may not have the strength required') into the mouth of Maecenas. Maecenas' question about his poet's readiness for battle is similar to Horace's concern in *S*. II.1.1–4 that some say his satire is too soft and nerveless (… *sine nervis altera quidquid / composui pars esse putat* …). The "small voice" is a basic ingredient for *recusationes*, which Horace often couches in military terms, such as in the opening of his letter to Augustus (*Cum tot sustineas et tanta negotia solus, / res Italas armis tuteris … in publica commoda peccem, / si longo sermone morer tua tempora, Caesar*, *Epist*. II.1.1–4) and to Florus, when Horace implies that his arms (military and literary) are an ill-match for Caesar's (*Caesaris Augusti non responsura lacertis*, *Epist*. II.2.48).[10] In the epode ***tuum*** *labore quid iuvem* ***meo*** (v. 15) replays the pronouns of the opening, *paratus omne Caesaris periculum / subire, Maecenas*, ***tuo***, so that the concern Maecenas expresses about Horace's usefulness parallels the military risks that he assumes for Octavian. The

[9] Horace leaves *friend* (*amice*, 2) without a limiting pronoun referent so that the vocative identifies Maecenas both as *Horace's* friend and *Caesar's*. Osgood, 2006: 362–364, sees the military loyalty oath to Octavian behind: *amice*; the formulaic phrase *paratus omne Caesaris periculum / subire* (3–4a); and Horace's hyperbolic rendition on how he would campaign with Maecenas anywhere in any war (11–24). Horace may be working the loyalty oath into the language of his epode (see earlier Babcock, 1974: 14–31; Kraggerud, 1984: 28–32; Nisbet, 1984: 10), but the oath forms part of a broader social contract, the obligation between clients and patrons that holds together the separate classes and ranks. This broader view is evident by the end of the epode and the attention Horace gives to thanking Maecenas for his generosity (25–32). Based on this epode, von Premerstein's conclusion (1937: 27–60) that the military oath paralleled in form the oath that a client made to a patron may deserve more consideration than Osgood (358, n.29) allows. Further, as Osgood acknowledges, Octavian excused Bononia from participating in the oath because that populace had long been Antony's clients (Suet. *Aug*. 17.2). The patron-client relationship held priority.

[10] Other Horatian *recusationes* include *C*. I.6; 19.9–12; II.1; 12; IV.2; 15; *Epist*. II.1.245–270; compare Race's comprehensive listing (1978: 191–193). On the *recusatio* and its potential for irony, see Johnson (2004b:14–26, 32–33, 205–210).

strength or weakness of Horace's service implies the strength or weakness of Maecenas'. When Horace places his patron in such a vulnerable position, trying to meet any danger to Caesar tit for tat, and then makes that relationship of superior to inferior parallel to his own situation in trying to meet the expectations Maecenas might have for him, Horace paints for Maecenas a nautical portrait of how daunting it is for him as a poet to sail among such warring greats in their towering ships. Each one, Horace and Maecenas, will honor the duties of their respective friendships. Both are going into battle: one to fight and one to write—challenging, hard obligations.

Horace's depiction of the battle and his pledge of friendship make the most of Callimachean imagery by transposing the familiar paradox of what we call the Callimachean dictum, reiterated by Vergil in a bucolic landscape (the slender Muse, song, together with the fat sacrifice, sheep, Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.21–24 Pf.; Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3–9a), into nautical/poetic warfare: Horace/Maecenas must sail in light galleys into battle among tall ships. Horace is in danger of being overwhelmed by the grandeur of his characters and themes, but what preserves him is his poetic swiftness and agility—the strategic advantages of the Liburnian bireme[11]—which enable him to enrich ("fatten") his *Epodes* with a high level of generic variety. To illustrate his versatility and the full range of his iambic potency, he transitions smoothly from Octavian, Maecenas, and war (vv.1–24: an epic theme, supported by an extended simile from the animal world) to the pleasures of his country retreat (vv.25–30: pastoral) to comic characters, the miser Chremes and the spendthrift (vv.31–34).[12]

---

[11] When Horace puts forward Homer as a model, he highlights Homer's swiftness and compression, qualities compatible with Callimachus' penchant for episodic form (*Ars* 148–152). Liburnians were quick and by comparison more maneuverable (Plu. *Ant.* 65.5; App. *Ill.* 3; Cass. Dio. 50.32.2–8; Viereck, 1975: 34–37). Most likely both Octavian's and Antony's/Cleopatra's fleets, however, had large ships equipped with towers. Even discounting poetic descriptions, it has proven impossible to separate factual detail from embellishment in the primary historical accounts on Actium (Plu. *Ant.* 61–68; Cass. Dio 50.12–35; cf. Syme, 1939: 296–298); Osgood (2006: 372–375) attempts the most recent reconstruction. For the evidence that Octavian exaggerated the number and size of Antony's ships to make his victory over such superior forces seem more grand, see Watson, 2003: 58. The prominence that Horace assigns to the swift Liburnians follows the Octavian story-line, but also chances giving away that Actium in reality was more of a race and chase than much of a fight.

[12] Horace is not prone to use extended similes in his iambics (Barchiesi, 2001: 155). Commentators, citing Callimachus' *Iambi* as a precedent for Horace's *Epodes*, are becoming more aware that this includes the Alexandrian penchant for "The Crossing of Genres" (Kroll, 1924: 202–224, "Die Kreuzung der Gattungen;" cf. Harrison's, 2007b: 104,

While Horace changes from one generic register to another, he overtly politicizes the literary by writing the Callimachean aesthetic into Actium and his patronage, and in doing so he continues the process that he began with his first word *Ibis* of investing Callimachean iambic with an Archilochean spirit. Horace defines his friendship with Maecenas by Callimachean markers and their opposites: life with Maecenas is pleasant and sweet (*iucunda*, *dulce*); without Maecenas heavy and bitter (*gravis*, *non dulce*, 6–8).[13] Horace naturally insists on following his friend to the ends of the earth. If Maecenas accepts this characterization of Horace's relationship with him (pleasant; sweet) and considers the poet his comrade, then Maecenas must accept Horace's service, his poetry, for what it is, no matter how mannered (Callimachean) it may be. The status of their relationship is projected into the poetry: with Maecenas, "pleasant;" without Maecenas, "heavy." If Maecenas, or we, thought that Horace's iambic voice was going to be too weak, this poem provides the answer, when Horace turns his deference into an artful response to his patron. Horace is as ready and fit for writing as Maecenas is for fighting. The song thus uses Callimachean imagery and language to argue an Archilochean topic, solidarity among friends, in such a way that it challenges the distinction between the powerful and weak, the useful and non-useful (*amice*, *comes* = Maecenas and Horace, different types of soldiers in similar circumstances).[14] If we do not want to read Horace as this critical, we could at least say that for a subordinate (Horace) in his dedicatory poem to remind his superior (Maecenas) that he too is a subordinate to a powerful patron (Octavian) in much the same way as Horace is to Maecenas attempts to cross established social boundaries.

---

overview and bibliography). Callimachus, for example, writes into his iambics the epigram and epinikion (*Iambi* 7–9). He debates openly the propriety/impropriety of joining iambic with other poetic types (*Iambus* 13). Horace puts on display the whole of Callimachus, his "slender Muse" and "fat sacrifice," or what Harrison terms "generic enrichment."

[13] A glance through Horace's *recusationes* shows that he tends to compare terms for moderation, brevity, and refinement favorably with their opposites; the cumulative effect is that code words for the "lesser" genres (e.g., *parvus*, *artus*, *tenuis*, *dulcis*, *gratus*) gain a preferred status over those descriptors for the "grander" (*gravis, saevus, grandis, operosa, maior*). Also note Horace's persistent imaging of himself as a poet of moderate means (*Epist*. II.1.118–131; cf. II.2.41–55, 180–216), wishing to escape the political hustle and hassles of Rome (*Epist*. II.2.65–86).

[14] N.b. *Epist*. II.1.124–155: the *vates* (poet-seer) is useful for the city. Although he is a lousy fighter (*militiae quamquam piger et malus utilis urbi*, 124), he improves citizens.

Later (*C.* II.7), Horace will again associate his life and death with Maecenas' well-being. This time, in order to lessen his patron's anxiety that he may die before his time, Horace erases any threat that the two could ever be separated by rewriting the singular "you / I" of epode 1 (*ego-tu*) into the plural first person (*ibimus, ibimus*, II.17.10):

Cur me querelis examinas tuis?
nec dis amicum est nec mihi te prius
obire, Maecenas, mearum
grande decus columenque rerum.

a, te meae si partem animae rapit
maturior vis, quid moror alteram,
nec carus aeque nec superstes
integer? ille dies utramque

ducet ruinam. non ego perfidum
dixi sacramentum: ibimus, ibimus,
utcumque praecedes, supremum
carpere iter comites parati.

me nec Chimaerae spiritus igneae
nec, si resurgat, centimanus Gyas[15]
divellet umquam. sic potenti
Iustitiae placitumque Parcis. (*C.* II.17.1–16)

Why do you take away (*ex-*) my soul (*animas*) with your complaints? It is not the gods' will (*amicum*) nor mine that you die before me, Maecenas, the great honor and support of my being. Ah, if an inopportune violence seizes you, part of my soul (*animae*), how could I, the other half, go on living, neither beloved as I was nor surviving whole? We will go, we will go, wherever you lead the way, prepared to take the final journey together as companions. Neither the fiery Chimaera's breath, nor hundred-handed Gyas, if he should rise again, will rip me apart from you, ever. Mighty Justice and the Fates have so decreed.

---

[15] If one wants a name to balance against *Chimaera*, "Gyas" (Lambinus, 1561) is the more convincing emendation for *gigas*, the reading of the codices. S.B. follows Bentley (1711) and prints the minor spelling "Gyges." Bentley comments that Muretus (1559: VI.13) had seen manuscripts that read *Gyges*, but more important to Bentley is the Hesiodic exempla with that name (*Theog.* 149, 618, 714, 734; "ut adhuc dubium sit, quo nomine Centimanus ille vocandus sit. Quaeramus igitur apud Graecos, in quorum officinis haec omnia conficta sunt, et ad Latinos delata."). I think there is still room for doubt, and as Bentley concludes, it does not matter one whit ("rectene an secus, ***neque scire nunc fas est***, nec hilum interest: neque enim Horatii salus in hoc nomine vertitur."). What is smart about Bentley's commentary is how he spontaneously imitated Horace's denial of the omniscient narrator in the *intermissio* of the epinikion for Drusus (***nec scire fas est omnia***, *C.* IV.4.22). As Horace says there, *quaerere distuli* (4.21).

Horace draws the comparisons with epode 1 tightly: the motif of journey as death; the repetition *superstite* (1.5), *superstes* (17.7) at line end; the promise of constant companionship (*vita … / iucunda, si contra, gravis?*, 1.5b–6; *quid moror … / nec carus aeque*, 17.6b–7a; *persequemur*, 1.7; *utcumque praecedes*, 17.11); the modification of the singular "I" into the plural "We" (*ibis … paratus … comes*, 1.1–17, becomes *ibimus, ibimus … comites parati*, 17.10–12).[16] Through the interplay of the two poems, Horace both affirms that he is prepared to die with Maecenas as much as Maecenas was prepared to die for Caesar, and he reminds his patron that Maecenas faced death before and survived. He attempts to bolster Maecenas not only by declaring through the language of *animae dimidium meae … alter* that he and Maecenas are two halves of the same self, an undivided unity (cf. *S.* I.5.41–42; *C.* I.3.1–8; IV.10.7),[17] but by writing his patron's anxiety, hypochondria or not, into the realm of the mythic (vv.13–16), which makes his fear about death appear more remote, something monstrous, perhaps irrational (possibly fabricated), in contrast to the very real dangers in epode 1, towering ships and battles.

To what degree Horace's claim of friendship in *C.* II.17 will persuade his patron to abandon his anxiety about death depends largely on the change from the more distinguishable singulars "you" and "me" in epode 1 to an indivisible plural "us" (*integer*, 17.8). Horace's move to revise the dynamics of *amicitia* into an expression of equality in matters of life and death (c.17) implies that he wrote into epode 1 some degree of singularity, a clearer distinction in classes and circumstances between patron and client. C.17, then, uncovers the hierarchies operative in epode 1, that nobility and its claims to power reinforce distinction and consequently threaten to bring separation. Epode 1 contains within its argument a definitive social strata: Octavian to Maecenas to Horace.

Thus, Horace gives a strong answer back to Maecenas' notion that his poet may be too weak to be effective in the service that he is offering (*imbellis ac firmus parum*, 16), but any reader familiar with the Archilochean-iambic tradition might well think the opposite, that this

---

[16] *C.* II.17 combines the imagery of epode 1 and ode 1: Horace rewrites *o et praesidium et dulce decus meum* (c.1.2) and the threatening *alta navium, … propugnacula* (epode 1.1–2) into *grande decus* and *columen* (c.17.4). The switch maintains the first epode's resolute physicality, but changes danger and threat into an image of strong support and integrity (wholeness) between poet and patron.

[17] Horace reserves the motif *alterum / animae dimidium meae* for Vergil and Maecenas; see Johnson, 2004b: 141–145.

opening epode in the literary arena introduces too soft a side for iambic (*mollis*) by beginning with friendship ("us" in like situations) and not so much enmity ("against you"). Nevertheless, as the iamb runs its course, it steadily exposes the profit margins and losses in patronage and involves Maecenas, the dedicatee, in also working to earn the approval of his more powerful friend (*bellum* as Maecenas' *labor*). The poet, perhaps carefully but none too tactfully, insinuates that his patron is as much of an *amicus* in the obligatory sense of the term as he. If this does not seem a strong enough answer, we can look ahead to the end of the *Odes* and note that when Horace refers to Vergil as a *cliens* (*C.* IV.12), this is enough to cause many to deny that Horace could be addressing the famous poet. *Cliens* would be too demeaning a term for Horace to use for his friend Vergil. This is when Vergil was in fact a *cliens*.[18] True enough Horace does not call Maecenas or himself a *cliens* but an *amicus*; nevertheless, he presents a Maecenas bound to specific obligations that may well cost him his life.

The iambic tone of the opening poem emerges once its literary concerns (hard versus soft) are set within its social and historic circumstances. On the eve of Actium Horace dares to write about friendships in which the less powerful friends may well die together and for their greater friend, so that in the ultimate sense both friends become the other's equal. Such a dedication gains its iambic spirit by depicting how a certain understanding of unity can lead to a war where Romans will fight against Romans: warring patrons force clients to choose sides and honor their obligations. As Horace later warns Asinius Pollio, who is on the verge of giving up his tragic Muse for writing history, powerful friendships have serious, wide-ranging pressures (*gravisque principum amicitias*):

Motum ex Metello consule civicum
bellique causas et vitia et modos
ludumque Fortunae gravisque
principum amicitias et arma

nondum expiatis uncta cruoribus,
periculosae plenum opus aleae,
tractas et incedis per ignis
suppositos cineri doloso. (*C.* II.1.1–8)

The civil commotion that began when Metellus was consul, and the causes of the war, its offenses and rhythms, and Fortune's sport, and the leaders' oppressive alliances (*gravisque principum amicitias*), and weapons

[18] For arguments on *Vergilius est poeta* (*C.* IV.12), see Johnson (2004b) 159–166.

anointed with unexpiated gore, a work full of perilous gambles, you are handling; and you are walking on ash covering the fiery embers, which you think safe.

The alliance that appears so beautiful at the beginning of epode 1 (its loyalty, faithfulness, friendship) turns into an aesthetic of dread (scared mother birds, snakes, death, vv.19–22; fires that look to be under control but are not, *C.* II.1.6–8).

That Horace closes out epode 1 by saying that he, the lesser friend, has already been enriched enough by his patron (Maecenas) and by asserting the principle of *mediocritas*,[19] as well as naming stock comic characters (the spendthrift and miser), strikes hard against the extreme and tragic realities of war, and on a most personal level:

satis superque me benignitas tua
   ditavit; haud paravero
quod aut avarus ut Chremes terra premam
   discinctus aut perdat nepos. (31–34)

Your benefaction has made me rich enough, and more than enough. I will not acquire such wealth either to bury it in the ground like Chremes the miser or squander it like a no account wastrel.

Horace's reference to comic characters predicts that he will start searching for and eventually find a different tune than the one sung by Metellus, who fails to make his history sound any different from his tragedy (*C.* II.1.17–24). Horace will find another path:

sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis
Ceae retractes munera neniae,
   mecum Dionaeo sub antro
      quaere modos leviore plectro. (*C.* II.1.37–40)

But do not, impetuous Muse, desert your jests and take up again the duties of the Cean funeral song; with me, in Love's grotto, seek rhythms of a lighter note.

Within the generic richness of the first of his iambics, Horace cannot resist a touch of the lyrical:

feremus, et te vel per Alpium iuga
   inhospitalem et Caucasum
vel Occidentis usque ad ultimum sinum
   forti sequemur pectore.[20] (epode 1.11–14)

---

[19] Compare Archil. fr. 93 W, which speaks against warring for profit.
[20] On S.B.'s (1985) punctuation, … *sequemur pectore*?, see *infra*.

> We will endure and follow you, whether over the heights of the Alps and the cruel Caucasus or all the way to the furthest Western shore, with valiant heart.

This catalogue of places to where Horace would be willing to follow Maecenas echoes Catullus' litany of remote destinations in his promise to Aurelius and Furius that they will remain his companions no matter how far they journey (*omnia haec, quaecumque feret voluntas / caelitum, temptare simul parati*, c.11.13–14), which is one of only two songs, as far as we know, that Catullus wrote in the Sapphic meter.[21] But for now, Horace's Lesbian lyre will remain an allusion hiding in the background, while the tension continues to grow.

For the entirety of epode 1 Horace speaks in *persona poetae*, and the perspective he expresses blends so harmoniously with the opening verses of epode 2 that the illusion is created that the poet has continued talking in the first person from the first iamb to the next. Horace (epode 2.1–6) picks up on the argument at the end of epode 1 that the simple lifestyle, specifically one uncomplicated by business obligations, suits him best. He reviews the same occupations as in epode 1 but in reverse order: farming, battle, and sailing. His general attitude aligns with one of his primary themes in *Satires* I: a life ruled by moderation pleases him far better than the pursuit of luxurious excesses.[22] The assumption that Horace is the speaker is not ruled out until the last four lines of epode 2, when the narrator identifies himself as the loan-shark Alfius, who for all his dreaming of a more peaceful life in the country, will not give up the rewards his financial risk-taking earns. After all, such careers as lending money, importing-exporting, warring, writing poetry for patrons may be tough business, but someone has to do them and profit from them. The comic amusement of the bait-and-switch in narrators (not Horace but a money-lender praises the simple life) has a serious side, when his protest that he is not actually interested in all this important business of money and rewards is shown to be, as is typical of his sort, only a pretense.[23]

---

[21] Note Catullus' famous rendition (c.51) of Sappho fr. 31 L.-P.

[22] Cf. *S.* I.1; I.2 (compare the rich diet, vv.115–116, with epode 2.49–54); I.3.137–142; I.6.93–111.

[23] There is Archilochean precedent (fr. 19 W) for the *persona loquens* of epode 2, and consequently Watson (2003: 85) rejects any assimilation between the narrators of epodes 1 and 2; compare Fowler (1994: 231–256) and Oliensis (1998: 84–87). I side with the latter, because the interconnections are too pervasive to be overlooked: the Sabine woman and her Apulian husband connects Horace's birthplace with his estate (vv.42–43); the first person *me* in the middle of the description about the pleasures in country living (41–60)

Horace by the smooth thematic transition between the two epodes and withholding the shift in speakers to the last moment puts his audience through a ruse that could well cause them to question his own credibility, when he claims to be disinterested in the business side of *amicitia* and satisfied with the property he already has (epode 1). Much later he will come clean and expose his duplicity, confessing to his rich friend Vala that living a modest life is not all that appealing:

nimirum hic ego sum. nam tuta et parvula laudo
cum res deficiunt, satis inter vilia fortis;
verum ubi quid melius contingit et unctius, idem
vos sapere et solos aio bene vivere, quorum
conspicitur nitidis fundata pecunia villis. (*Epist.* I.15.42–46)

I am very much such a fellow. I praise a safe and humble lifestyle, when things are in short supply, being brave enough on the cheap. But when something better and plusher happens along, I, the very same fellow, say that you in particular are wise and live well, since you have poured your wealth into gleaming villas on full display.

Just how different is Maecenas from Horace and Horace from Alfius? "Will the real Horace-Alfius, please stand up?" Truth is—Horace's and any dependent's *amicitia* may involve hard business (war, politics, money changing hands), but dependency does have its rewards (political power, the quietude of a bucolic estate, cash).[24] Finding Horace's "professed" simple lifestyle in a loan-shark's wishful daydreams implicates the iambist in his own mockery. Epode 2 places the iambist on the receiving end of the criticism.

---

duplicates sentiments Horace expressed in *Satires* I; the comic characters at the end of epode 1 (the miser Chremes and the spendthrift) contrast well with the loan-shark Alfius. Harrison (2001:170–176), while defining the Archilochean background of epodes 1 and 2, comments on Maecenas as *amice* and the illusion of the speaker in epode 2 but not on how epode 2 may alter the impressions of epode 1.

[24] When the warring Turnus and Aeneas match each other slaughter for slaughter (*Aen.* 12), Vergil increases the horror of the bloody scene by pausing briefly on one of Aeneas' victim's bucolic lifestyle: "Arcadian Menoetes, as a young man, in vain hated war. He was skilled in fishing around the streams of Lerna. He had a humble home and knew nothing about waiting on the powerful (*nec nota potentum / munera*), but his father planted rented land," 12.517–520. Menoetes may not have attended the rich and powerful, but he could not escape their wars. The earliest complete manuscript of the *Aeneid* (Mediceus) reads *nec nota potentum / limina*. The variant *munera / limina* clarifies the sense of epode 2.7–8: *Forumque vitat et superba civium / potentiorum limina*. To be at the threshold of the powerful brings gifts and obligations (*munera*, glossed by Servius *obsequia*).

Again, as in epode 1, the criticism gains strength from the historical circumstances of civil conflict, and how the war revolves around relationships. It is a nervy client-poet who will write such an idealized praise for the simple and small ancestral farm, when many of these had been confiscated by the Caesar of epode 1—and when land was given to him as an act of patronage.[25] A client-iambist is hardly weak (as Maecenas might be tempted to think in epode 1), when he has the daring to school his patron and himself that it is one thing to say the "blessings" the powerful grant "are more than enough," but it is quite another to choose to live without them. Escaping 'class acts,' masters and underlings with their privileges and responsibilities, does not happen easily, if at all.[26]

The temptation to focus narrowly on this epode's "I," prompted by the iambist's play on the narrator's identity, can mask how widely the iambist casts his blame. When Alfius becomes the narrator, his representation of the gentrified country-life turns out to be a seductive fantasy. That a loan-shark would know anything about the daily realities facing a *rusticus* (Alfius' wish not mine: *iam iam futurus rusticus*, v.68) proves laughable, and the idealism in his account tattles on his naiveté: the farmland growing everything well in its varied topography and offering every type of game (9–38); the knowledgeable rehearsal of sweet treats (49–54); the wondrous plentitude of the family farm, which includes a rich troop of home-grown slaves (61–66). Add in that Alfius cannot resist mentioning interest (*faenore*, v.4).[27] Alfius' blessed farmer, household and all, inhabit another world as removed from him as the Blessed Isles are from the war-weary Romans:

> nos manet Oceanus circum vagus arva beata:
> petamus arva, divites et insulas,
> reddit ubi Cererem tellus inarata quotannis
> et imputata floret usque vinea,

---

[25] Confiscations began in 41 BC, continued, and perhaps were on-going when the epode was written (App. *BC.* 4.3; 5.13–22; Plu. *Ant.* 55); see Watson (2003: 81–82). Most assume that the beneficence Maecenas granted Horace in epode 1 was the Sabine farm. Mankin (1995: epode 1, n.31–32) notes that Horace does not say this directly. The implication, however, is hard to ignore. Horace promises to fight to win Maecenas' favor, claims his present estate is large enough, and then thanks Maecenas for his kindness.

[26] Likewise, Aristotle condemned "banausic" labor (e.g., industrial education; money management), because it ruined autonomy and resulted in a loss of self-control (*Pol.* 1256a–1258; *EN* 122a–130b; 1123a19–35; Seaford, 1994: 201–202; Johnson 2004b: 23–25). Self-sufficiency is the ideal.

[27] Mankin (1995: 63) and Watson (2003: 80) conclude that the audience should know that Horace cannot be the speaker well before the epode ends.

germinat et numquam fallentis termes olivae
  suamque pulla ficus ornat arborem,
mella cava manant ex ilice, montibus altis
  levis crepante lympha desilit pede.
illic iniussae veniunt ad mulctra capellae
  refertque tenta grex amicus ubera,
nec vespertinus circumgemit ursus ovile
  neque intumescit alta viperis humus.
pluraque felices mirabimur: ut neque largis
  aquosus Eurus arva radat imbribus
pinguia nec siccis urantur semina glaebis,
  utrumque rege temperante caelitum. (epode 16.41–56)

There is waiting for us Oceanus embracing the Blessed Fields: seek out with me the Fields and Isles Rich, where the earth, though unplowed, produces yearly her grain and the vine forever flourishes untended, and the olive branch blooming never disappoints, and the dark fig trims her tree, honey flows from the hollows of the oak, from the high mountains water nimbly leaps with plashing gait. There the goats unbidden come to their milk-pails and the flock, willing ally, returns full udders, neither does the bear, hidden in the dusk, snarl about the sheepfold, nor do vipers lie above on the ground. And we with all these blessings will marvel even more at how stormy Eurus rakes not the fields with her torrential rains, how seeds bursting are not scorched in thirsty clods, since the king of the heavens measures well both water and warmth.

Alfius' idealism may be incredible but not the contradiction he represents. No less a moralist than Cato the Censor praised the life of the peasant-farmer, while he engaged in money-lending for profit (*Agr. praef.*; Plu. *Cat.* 21.5–6). It is more likely that Horace's urban elite audience, who frequently escaped to the country for pleasure and rest, like Bostonians running for the Berkshires, would be taken in more readily by "Horace-Alfius." The tensions in this poem are poignant because the degree of deception in the sudden shift of speakers depends on class mentalities and prejudices.

The movement from war's realties to utopian vision in epodes 1, 2, and 16 betrays an iambist who at first can barely decide which emotion to vent or repress: fear, inadequacy, rage, or hope, because in Rome's real world (epode 1–2) there is friendship and orders to obey with their dangers and rewards (***amice** … **iussi***, epode 1.2–7). Goats do not come for milking without orders (***inussae***, epode 16.49) and sheep do not just show up out of friendship (*grex **amicus***, epode 16.50). The bird guarding her nest must be on the lookout for snakes (compare epode 1.19–22 with *neque intumescit alta viperis humus*, epode 16.52). Horace cannot afford

to be like the laughable stock characters of a comedy, Chremes and the spendthrift (epode 1.33–34).[28] The *Epodes* at their outset do not allow much room for wishful thinking. Even Alfius is stuck in reality. Although his fabricated farm has its allure, unlike the Isles of the Blessed, it does not provide any escape from the natural order of things: seasons change; sustenance requires labor; summer sleep is only a momentary respite before the winter storms begin again. Pleasure, instead, comes from the independence felt in providing well for one's own family without the pressures imposed by an invasive society (*dapes inemptas*, v.48). Then, with little more than a shrug of his shoulders and a sigh (*iam*, *iam*, v.68), Alfius gives up his daydream, returns to the world he knows, and goes back to business as usual, as if to say, "It would be nice, wouldn't it, if we all could escape from the necessities of such mercantile economics, but society inevitably involves external obligations, and that is just the way of it. I might as well merit some return from the whole affair and do it fast."[29]

Horace's first word to Maecenas, *ibis*, which names Callimachus' attack on Apollonius, has a far-reaching sting. Maecenas will follow Octavian into battle; Horace will enjoy his estate; Alfius will lend out his money again. Horace declares his absolute loyalty to Maecenas with a string of future participles: *an hunc laborem, mente* ***laturi*** *… comes minore sum* ***futurus*** *in metu … auxili /* ***latura*** *plus*, epode 1.9,17, 21b–22. The next future participle in the series belongs to the hypocrite Alfius: *iam iam* ***futurus*** *rusticus* (epode 2.68). The higher to lower levels of society, from the allied nobles to the despicable creditor, are stuck fast in potentially destructive cycles, one of dependency and the other of hopeful delusion, just as intractable as the "bound-up" luxuriant banqueter longing for the softening effect of the mallow, because he went ahead and gobbled down the delicacies (epode 2.49–60).[30]

There is garlic mixed in with banquet-fare (epode 3). It cramps Horace and may well ruin Maecenas' good time:

---

[28] See also Barchiesi, 2001: 152.

[29] Thom (2000: 41) thinks that Alfius comes off somewhat better than the dreamer of epode 16, because he realizes it is best to stay in his real world when all is said and done. It is hard though to be sympathetic with a loan-shark. I imagine Alfius' debtors were disappointed when he came to his senses. Horace's language in epode 16 does not just echo Alfius' bucolic fantasy, it interacts with the hard realities of war in epodes 1 and 7. Horace, by creating responsion between all three epodes, manages to explore sympathetically the human need to keep on hoping reality can be altered. Horace, therefore, offers a complicated variation on the bucolic Vergil's *Golden Age* (*Ecl.* 4).

[30] Cf. Mankin, 1995: 84, n.58.

Parentis olim si quis impia manu
senile guttur fregerit,
edit cicutis alium nocentius.
o dura messorum ilia!
quid hoc veneni saevit in praecordiis?

at si quid umquam tale concupiveris,
iocose Maecenas, precor
manum puella savio opponat tuo
extrema et in sponda cubet. (epode 3.1–5; 19–22)

If anyone ever throttles his aged parent by the throat, make him eat garlic more lethal than hemlock. O, how tough are reapers' guts! What kind of poison is this raging in my belly?

But, jester Maecenas, if you ever crave to play such a joke again, may your lady, I pray, block your kiss with her hand and cling to the edge of the couch.

The plot-line runs on from epodes 1–2 into epode 3. The iambist-*cliens* may have had enough rewards, but here he is attending a banquet at his patron's home. Like Alfius Horace is still about his business, and it is giving him indigestion. The savory dishes he is served up, a common reward in comedy for services rendered, are laced with garlic.[31] The epode's fun (most reminiscent of Catullus) depends on the hyperbolic disjunction between eating some spicy food and the frightening mythic figures of the accused cooks: Canidia, Medea, and Deianira, three witches supreme (vv.6–14).[32] What is so bewitching about this banquet-time garlic that it gives the poet heartburn and prevents Maecenas from enjoying his sexy lady? Worse than hemlock it is, since it ruins the banquet for both poet and patron: some joke—hot hearts, no sex.

[31] The first joke outside of the prologue in Plautus' *Menaechmi* is based on the supposition that a full stomach remains loyal. *Peniculus* deserves his name ("brush," "sponge") because when he eats he wipes his master's table clean (*Iuventus nomen fecit Peniculo mihi, / ideo quia mensam, quando edo, detergeo*, 77–78). He advises the audience to forget putting chains on run-away slaves or prisoners of war. Feed them well and they will never leave. He for one does not mind serving his master Menaechmus, who serves sumptuous banquets fit for the festivals of Ceres.

[32] The disjunction includes a fancy banquet in a rich home compared to rustic fare (*edit cicutis alium nocentius. / o dura messorum ilia!*, vv.3–4; cf. *Thestylis et rapido fessis messoribus aestu / alia serpullumque herbas contundit olentis*, Verg. *Ecl.* 2.10–11). The tone of epode 3, comic hyperbole, was captured by Fraenkel (1957: 68–69), who compared it to Cat. 44 for ethos and structure; but, there is also serious business being transacted at this banquet between client and patron (Fitzgerald, 1983: 181–182; Oliensis, 1998: 88). *Quamquam ridentem dicere verum / quid vetat?* (Hor. *S.* I.1.24b–25a).

The witches are one component in the epode's parodic humor, maintained by Horace from beginning to end: the sinister crime of patricide punished by garlic (vv.1–3); garlic as snake's blood (vv.5–6); the garlic-cooks Canidia, Medea, and Deianira in full tragic guise (vv.7–18). The parallel "ifs" in the opening and closing lines liken Maecenas to the worst sort of murderer, and then place a curse on the jester Maecenas that he miss out on a little cuddle with his mistress (vv.19–22). Horace reduces the greatest of crimes and tragedies to a breakup on a banquet couch because of a bad fart (Horace's indigestion, *ilia*) or smelly breath (Maecenas' mouth). As funny as this whole affair is, the smell gives away the intensity of Horace's curse on Maecenas. Who else smells in the *Epodes*? Canidia's witchy concoction (epode 5.15–41); the aging mistress with her drooping derrière (epode 8.1–6); Maevius (epode 10.1–2); the nymphomaniac (epode 12.3–12). The iambist, more keen-scented than a hound-dog, sniffs out his targets (epode 12.6). The nose knows. Aristophanes would love this.

As it turns out, Maecenas is the "witchy" one who slipped too much garlic into his poet's food, a joke that caught Horace by surprise. Maecenas, the *amice* (in battle risking his life for his patron Caesar, epode 1), is now presented by the iambist in very different character, *iocose Maecenas* (on the banquet couch at a party with his *cliens*). His position, although as patron-host he still rules over Horace, has been lowered or to be sure is less heroic, more potentially comic than tragic. This epode more than any other in the book stands by itself as a humorous piece; yet, it also connects well to the narrative developed by epodes 1 and 2, which reveals Horace's mixed attitude toward the rewards and obligations each participant in a society must meet, including himself. Yes, I am about to argue Maecenas' garlic is a metapoetic metaphor for the rewards and risks of working/writing for the powerful: it has its pleasures, but if those delicacies are not enjoyed in measure, they can make you smell and ruin the fun.

In epodes 1–3 poetry becomes business, and the best way for a poet to become "blocked-up" is to turn poetry into a *negotium* (cf. *Epist.* II.2.55–90). In epode 1 all have their social obligations. Maecenas fights for Caesar as he can and Horace will work for Maecenas (*an hunc laborem*, 9). Horace does not do this for rewards, although Maecenas has given them. The epode closes with mercantile language and the characters of comedy, the miser Chremes and the nameless spendthrift (vv.32–34). The first-person narrator of epode 2 prolongs the sentiments of the poet at the end of epode 1. He also swears off *negotium* with language that reinforces the

iambist's resistance to the obligations and rewards of *amicitia*. The blessed life is plowing ancestral fields (2.3), not farms earned by service (1.25–26: *non ut iuvencis illigata pluribus / aratra nitantur meis*); the blessed life shuns military obligations (2.5; cf. 1.23–24: *libenter hoc et omne militabitur / bellum in tuae spem gratiae*); it avoids the forum and the threshold of the powerful (2.7–8). Then, this idyllic escapism turns out to be a sham told by another comic character, the money-lender Alfius, who cannot calm his desire for the payoffs from *negotium*. Horace's delay in naming Alfius as the definitive narrator until the last four lines and the adjustment that results from that shift throws doubt onto the poet's own motivations. The iambist, read as an Alfius, becomes tinged with a hint of the hypocrite, ridiculing Alfius' inability to resist remuneration and the strings attached although the same fault plagues him.[33] In epode 3 there is more than a hint. Now Horace is attending a banquet at the house of his patron, doing exactly what the falsifying Alfius' "blessed man" never does—wait in attendance at the houses of the powerful (epode 2.7–8)—and the iambist is not eating those simple country herbs (sorrel and mallow) that keep the bowels clear (2.57–58). At this banquet he is the city-boy, whose delicate system is upset by rustic fare (*o dura messorum ilia!*, 3.4) worse than hemlock. The garlic could have been put there by Canidia, Medea, or Deianira, but no, it was added in by his friend. Maecenas, both patron and cook, provides the banquet, the delicacies that his poet enjoys; he enriched the poet more than enough with the goods of Alfius' simple life: flocks, herds in a cool valley, house, servants. These blessings are laced with garlic, which causes the poet major indigestion and could end up costing the patron his sexy fun: *sym-posion interruptum*—the break-up of society at its most pleasurable and basic levels. Perhaps this "garlic" is too strong to be dismissed with a wave of the hand.

"Wait a minute. Garlic at the banquet could be just that. The Romans use garlic, and Horace is writing up a joke on Maecenas."[34] Granted, Horace is teasing his friend and the tone of this iambic gag is comic. From

[33] The same hypocrisy without the comic bait-and-switch with the narrators and the innuendo (epodes 2–3) is on display in epode 4, when the iambist-son-of-a-freedman-become-military tribune derides a slave who rises to the same rank; see *infra*.

[34] I cite precedent. Fitzgerald (1988: 181–183) thinks the indigestion is a metaphor for Horace's ambivalence about his relationship with Maecenas; Oliensis (1998: 89) reads Horace's defensive reaction against Maecenas' garlic as the poet "figuratively raising a hand—his writing hand, as it were—against his patron." To summarize Fitzgerald's evidence: (1) Romans use intestinal upset as a metaphor for war and conflict (cf. Cat. 77);

the opening of the *Epodes* Horace incorporates stock comic characters within his iambic: the miser and the spendthrift (epode 1); the loan-shark (epode 2). Epode 3 invites a chuckle: garlic preventing a host from making-out with his girl. All of this on one level is amusing, exaggerated bravado, enjoyed between client and patron, if there is only a touch of reality in Plautine comedies such as the *Menaechmi* and *Captivi*. The anti-climactic banquet, comic fun with stomach-aches and missed kisses, releases readers momentarily from the more open forms of oppression evident in war or in the debts they might owe to their own "Alfius."[35] Such iambic humor (garlic/hemlock), if nothing more is meant, is well played by Horace, but this is not the only time he mentions tasting hemlock. Hemlock is his cure for writing verses for a patron, after he has already earned his keep:

> … paupertas impulit audax
> ut versus facerem; sed quod non desit habentem
> quae poterunt umquam satis expurgare cicutae,
> ni melius dormire putem quam scribere versus? (*Epist.* II.2.51–54)

> … Fierce poverty attacked me so that I wrote verses; but what amount of hemlock could suffice to purge me, now that I lack nothing, if I were not to think sleeping better than writing verses for pay?[36]

In the language of the epistle, it would be better for Horace to take the hemlock, clean out his system, and then take a rest perhaps permanently, than to continue writing verses for pay. In the language of epode 3, the patron's garlic, the rewards of the banquet feast, is worse than hemlock and can ruin the fun for everyone.[37] The poet is not living Alfius' "blessed" life, if he is attending his patron's tables and eating dishes that do not agree with him (*Forumque vitat et superba civium / potentiorum limina*, 2.7–8). His only defense is to dish up a little amusing iambic, a better alternative than suicide by hemlock.

(2) Horace's mythological exempla detail ruinous relationships between heroes and partners (Medea/Jason; Deianira/Herakles); (3) there is a correlation between epodes 3 and 4, where the experience of the upstart slave parallels Horace's relationship with Maecenas.

35 Cf. Gowers (1993: 309): Horace uses parodic humor to diffuse social conflicts, which allows good will to survive.

36 Cf. *scribere*, *Epist.* II.1.109–117.

37 I am reading the hemlock from *Epistle* II.2.55–54 back into epode 3 and disregarding a span of roughly fifteen years between the poems. What makes the poet's tone in the epistle so acerbic is that his change in status has not released him from his obligations to write. He finds himself fulfilling a patronage he thought by now he would have been able to live without. The tensions expressed in epodes 1–3 remain in the epistle.

I may not convince you that garlic is any more than garlic: in literary terms, I may have served up your iambic Horace too Archilochean and too little Callimachean, or perhaps the other way around. "I can never tell for sure what I should serve at a particular banquet, since everyone's tastes are so different" (*Epist.* II.2.58–64). Epode 3 has both *bilem* (the poet's indigestion) and *iocum* (the prankster). So Horace over ten years later describes his iambic mood (*O imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe / **bilem**, saepe **iocum** vestri movere tumultus!*, *Epist.* I.19.19–20). And while his first three epodes hold more potential for conflict than is often supposed, they do not leave out the laughter. The loan-shark Alfius and the cooks Canidia, Medea, and Deianira are comic hyperbole and not too threatening—yet. Social menace, however, is about to break out into the open and escalate.

Horace with epode 4 heads his iambs into full class warfare:

Lupis et agnis quanta sortito obtigit,
   tecum mihi discordia est,
Hibericis peruste funibus latus
   et crura dura compede.
licet superbus ambules pecunia,
   Fortuna non mutat genus.
videsne, Sacram metiente te viam
   cum bis trium ulnarum toga,
ut ora vertat huc et huc euntium
   liberrima indignatio?

"quid attinet tot ora navium gravi
   rostrata duci pondere
contra latrones atque servilem manum
   hoc, hoc tribuno militum?" (epode 4.1–10, 17–20)[38]

As different by nature wolves are from lambs, that is how different I am from you, your side marked by burns from Spanish ropes and your legs by the hard chain. Although you strut about arrogantly in your wealth, Fortune does not barter your class. Do you see, as you saunter along the whole Sacred Way, dressed up in your toga three meters wide, how rampant scorn turns upon you the gaze of those passing you on both the right and left?[39]

What difference does it make that so many ships, their faces loaded down with brazen beaks, are launched against bands of robbers and slaves, when this fellow, this fellow is a military tribune?

[38] Cf. Anacr. 43 *PMG*.
[39] On the translation of vv.7–10, see Horsfall (1973: 136–137).

This iambist is enraged and enrages. His first word (*lupis*, "wolves") names the most hostile side of Archilochean invective (*Lyk* [wolf]-*ambes*)[40] and his first line projects nature's enmity (*quanta sortito … discordia*) of predator-dominator (*lupis*) and prey-dominated (*agnis*) onto human relationships (*tecum mihi*). If different types of animals cannot live together well, people cannot either. To make the point, Horace places at the center of the invective perhaps his most sarcastic iambic criticism: *liberrima indignatio* (v.10). The freedman, acting as a free man, provokes extremely free disgust.[41] Outrage outperforms the libertine. The *parvenu* can play his new found role as richly as he may, but class prejudices, like the powers in the food-chain, are stable, not subject to shifting wealth (*Fortuna non mutat genus*, 6). All the bucolic "idyllism" in Alfius' imagination has vanished. Wolves do not lie down with lambs; they eat them. The slave attacked in this epode would have no problem believing that this iambist would be a strong enough companion for Maecenas and did follow Archilochus' meter and vitality.

The iambist (*mihi*) is the only verbal assailant for the first half of the attack, and then "that one" turns the attack over to the many at large (*euntium*, v.9). This shift in speaker, just as in epode 2, and here the inability to clearly define any identity for the single iambist, heightens the tensions within the invective. All that the speaker gives out about himself is that he is in no way comparable to the upstart-slave, whom he abuses, and so the opening lines contain nothing that would prevent an audience from again associating the first-person narrator with Horace, a completely natural supposition given the autobiographical staging of the opening epodes. Horace is not like this slave. He is the son of a freedman, not a recently freed slave. He has no marks of slavery, nor

---

40 On the debate surrounding the possible historicity of the etymologized names Lykambes and Neobule, see West, 1974: 26–28; Henderson, 1976: 160; Nagy, 1979: 243–248; Carey, 1986: 60–67; Slings, 1990: 23–26. On the common simile of iambist-wolf, see Miralles, 1983: 53–60; Davis, 1987: 69–73.

41 S. Braund (2004: 409–410) points out the tensions in satire between *libertas* and *licentia*: (*libertas*) acceptable versus unacceptable (*licentia*) free speech. A clever satirist can always say or imply, "I'm just kidding." Freudenburg (2001: 48–51) notes that freedom to speak, *libertas*, is joined to a speaker's claim to social status. Satire is not all "fun and games." Such frictions are all the more raw in iambic. Horace' superlative *liberrima indignatio* means that someone is pushing the boundaries of what is acceptable social behavior and speech, but Horace hides who, the upstart slave or his noble-minded detractors. Horace's iambic is of a different register (*liberrima*) than his satire: iambists, in particular of the Lykambid variety, utilize laughter, but they do not "kid around" or "take it back."

was he beaten until the attendant looking-on grew squeamish. None of his friends or acquaintances could ever remember him being a slave. Then, there is no need for Horace to go out of his way to assign to this upstart slave obvious characteristics that they would share: Horace is rich enough, thanks to Maecenas (epode 1.31–32); he strolls down the *Sacra Via* (*S.* I.9); he owns valuable land (*S.* II.6; epode 1); he rose above his station to serve as a military tribune (*S.* I.6.45–48). Confusing the iambist with Horace by such specific biographical markers renders the first words of the attack a lie. The assailant is not as different from his prey as a wolf is from a sheep. The open hypocrisy of this iambic with its liberal rage (*liberrima indignatio*) colors the verbal assault with a most discordant/illiberal tone. Here is a well-to-do freedman attacking a fortunate ex-slave.

I could rush to Horace's defense: the iambic genre includes self-defamation of worse sorts than this, and mockery often envelops the iambist and not just the target (for example, epode 2).[42] Compared to epode 2 and 3, however, here there is more bile than joke. Horace's audience could relish a smile at the iambist's expense,[43] but they are just as likely to be offended and annoyed at a lower-born poet displaying an attitude that could typify most members of the established nobility and call into question a fundamental tenet of Roman societal structures, namely that the highborn are by nature superior to the lowborn (*Fortuna non mutat genus*, v.6; cf. *C.* IV.4.29–36).[44] Conflating the character of the iambist and the *parvenu* becomes even riskier in the tumultuous triumviral period, when an upstart was not a comic stock character, who would provoke a laugh, but a reality. What is more, Horace makes his braggart ex-slave

[42] Compare Hipponax's account—perhaps in the tradition of the *pharmakos*—of a Lydian woman curing his impotence by whipping his balls and using some form of rectal suppository, which forced him to defecate (fr. 92 W). Horace by contrast places the blame on others for any impotence on the satirist's/iambist's part (*S.* II.1.1–4; epodes 8 and 12).

[43] Cf. Watson, 1995: 197; 2003: 150–152; Oliensis, 1998: 67–68.

[44] Horace knows the principle. Since nobility births nobility, and a child inherits a high-born character at birth, Phyllis cannot be the daughter of a money-grubbing prostitute (*C.* II.4.14–20). On whether or not Drusus' attack on the Vindelici, celebrated in *C.* IV.4, reflects the character of his parent/s, Ti. Claudius Nero and Octavian, see Johnson (2004b: 103–104, 109–113). For further examples, see Marcovich (1975: 8). Accordingly, "new men," the first in a family to obtain the consulship (e.g., Cicero, Ventidius, Decidius Saxa, Canidius Crassus), were often subjects of jealousy and hostility (Sall. *J.* 63.7; *Cat.* 23.6); for a fuller review of examples and evidence, see Osgood, 2006: 257–260.

seem genuine, a character of history, by placing the upstart within the framework of the battles of Octavian against Sextus Pompeius (vv.17–19).[45]

Epode 4 replays within one poem the affinity between the speakers of epodes 1–3 (the dutiful poet-iambist / the daydreaming loan-shark Alfius / the fed-up poet) without the subtle cleverness and comic twists. When Horace for the first time (epode 4) puts blame and rage on full display, he directs it at someone enough like himself that this invective entirely muddles the distinctions between wolf and lamb, predator and prey, who in the first two couplets seem so different. Moreover, the iambist is giving voice to the common attitude of his own society against the *parvenu*. The epode begins with a seemingly more subjective voice, but this voice in short order conveys stereotypical class values, expressed by unnamed persons walking past the upstart on the street (*ut ora vertat huc et huc euntium / liberrima indignatio?*, 9–10). The iambist only represents the outlook of the people. Therefore, any hypocrisy that the iambist personifies finds its impetus in society. Iambic does not stay on the level of individual animosity, and therefore the anonymity of the invective increases its applicability.[46] When an invective names a target, and "friends" and "enemies" become well-defined, the blame is moderated by cut and dry parameters. There is no need to justify an attack to those who are sure "we" are not like "them." Horace does not allow these distinctions. His no-named iambist and upstart slave leave his audience free to infer and guess their identities, and the resulting speculation widens the blame to whomever happens not to meet the approval of those passing by them on the street.[47] This collage of blame, which includes Horace and his background, prevents any outside observer from knowing with whom to be sympathetic.

The shift in narrator from the iambist to society also allows the speaker in the opening to be read from a different motivation, one based on justified self-interest. He may not be a hypocrite but a victim himself. For example, Horace presents himself as the object of finger-pointing

[45] Anacreon's Artemon (fr. 388 PMG), a worthless rogue who rises to great wealth, offers an intriguing parallel (cf. Lenz, 1994: 483–501), but Horace maintains a completely viable Roman context for epode 4. On the tendency to underestimate the severity of the civil war with Sextus Pompeius, see Powell and Welch (2002); Powell (2008: 22–23); n.b., on epode 4, Watson (2003: 169–171).

[46] Compare Harrison, 2001: 176.

[47] Porphyrio names Pompeius Menas; the manuscript titles give both Menas and Vedius Rufus (Wickham, 1874: *praef.*; Mankin, 1995: 99; Levi, 1997: 49).

and suspicion for his rise in station (*S*. I.6.45–64; II.6.32–58), and in his later career he remembered its vehemence (*et iam dente minus mordeor invido*, *C*. IV.3.16). Likewise, this iambist may have heard the kinds of insults made about the *nouveau riche* so often that he could repeat them verbatim, and would know the circumstances of his own class origins are close enough to the slave that he may be attacked too. His invective would be more of a counter-protest ('I am not you') designed to keep himself safe. The failure of the iambist, then, to distinguish himself clearly from his target, which is prompted by Horace's insertion of his own life's details into the invective, raises other concerns very acute in a civil war environment. What if the attacked finds enough willfulness and power to resist, defend himself, and retaliate? Worse yet, what if two aggressors face-off (such as Octavian and Sextus Pompeius, vv.17–20), and the victory of the more powerful still produces negative consequences, such as the instability of the established class system? The last three verses are not incidental commentary. If someone from the lowest class can become a military tribune, what is the difference between winners and losers (predator and prey)? Why bother building a fleet that can defeat Pompeius and his gang: *quid attinet*? (v.17).

Lykambid Infection (Epodes 5–6)

Horace's first four epodes are lessons on social discontent, severe enough to test the standard assumptions about how Roman class orders are formulated and relate to each other. As conflicts emerge, aggression increases until it works its way through the iambist's smile and reveals its divisive potential for society. The stage is set for Horace's personification of wrath and retaliatory rage, the witch Canidia (epode 5).[48] A "weak"

[48] Why would a witch be a good choice for Horace's antagonist besides the obvious, that ἐπῳδή means incantation? Mockery, a key characteristic of iambic, was also present in magical curses (Barchiesi, 2009: 235, 241 n.24). Conveniently, the witch offers a versatile character. On one hand, she can be typecast: an ugly old outcast, subject to being dismissed with a laugh, albeit a nervous one, which is how Horace cuts short Canidia's first appearance—a farting wooden Priapus chases her and Sagana out of Maecenas' Esquiline gardens (*S*. I.8.46–50)—but not her last, epode 17 (see the Introduction for Canidia as *pharmakos*). Canidia is always at work on a stronger spell, evidence that her magic sometimes fails and testimony to her obdurate resilience (Watson, 2003: 189). She can be symbol. The gardens of Maecenas were reclaimed burial grounds, and it was hard for the Priapean "scarecrow" in the new gardens (Rome's revitalization) to ward off the witches searching for bones (Rome's decayed past); see Anderson, 1972: 4–13; Hooley, 2007: 58–60. Witches are on the fringe of society, working their magic in a way that is out-of-

iambist (*imbellis ac firmus parum*, epode 1.16) might at this point turn back and display a softer side for his audience's pleasure; Horace, instead, pushes ahead and flaunts rage. Canidia and her witchy magnetism exemplify how captivating and appalling unrestrained blackness can be: "then enraged Canidia, biting away at her untrimmed thumbnail with her black tooth, what did she say or rather did she say it all?" (epode 5.48–50).[49] Canidia fascinates, and yet a witch like Canidia, busy disemboweling an

---

bounds (Dickie, 2001: 162–201). On the other hand, witches and places they inhabit are real and threatening, grounded in Roman society and landscape (Plin. *H.N.* 30.1–15; Tac. *Ann.* 2.69; Ingallina, 1974: 16–24; Liebeschuetz, 1979: 126–139, 226–227; Watson, 2003: 176–182): gardens barely cover over old cemeteries; abandoned fields become soldiers' tombs (where Pompey finds the witch Erictho, Luc. *Phars.* 6.569–578); cadavers and bones are desecrated (Tib. 1.5.47–56; Petr. *Satyr.* 63; Lucan's Erictho, *Phars.* 6.507–568, 579–588; Apuleius' Pamphile, *Met.* 3.19–24; the corpse of Thelyphron, Apul. *Met.* 2.30–31); spells are cast (Twelve Tables VIII; Luc. *Phars.* 6.434–506); children disappear (*CIL* VI 19747). Laws are needed to regulate sorcery (Plin. *H.N.* 30.12). In 29 BC, the time of the *Epodes*, Maecenas advised Octavian to prohibit all practitioners of magic. Earlier, 33 BC, Agrippa expelled astrologers and magicians from Rome (for specific applications of the *Lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficiis* to magic and the extent of the expulsions, see Dickie, 2001: 142–161). Witches, like demons, represent *liminal* characters, not rightly divine or fully human. They embody the power of transgressing limits, which makes them perfectly iambic (cf. Barchiesi, 2001: 152). To use the appropriate iambic metaphor—witches stand at the threshold (*limen*), neither inside nor outside. This makes Canidia akin to the distorted female representations in iambic, such as Iambe and Baubo (cf. Barchiesi, 2009: 245).

[49] Canidia is Horace's prominent female character, named in six poems (*S.* I.8, II.1.48, 8.95; epodes 3, 5, 17) and linked to three others with unnamed addressees (epodes 8, 12, and *C.* I.16); only Chloë comes close (*C.* I.23; III.7; 9; 19 [variant]; 26). Speculation on Canidia begins with the scholiasts and continues strong: see Mankin's (1995: 299–301) summary on Canidia; add Hahn (1939: 213–230), Carrubba (1965: 591), Rudd (1966: 148–149), D' Arms (1967:141–145), Manning (1970: 393–401), Oliensis (1991: 107–138; 1998: 68–73 and *passim*), and Watson (2003: 135, 197–198). Is Canidia a real person (a Neapolitan perfumer, and presumably Horace's love-interest, named Gratidia; Porph. ad *S.* I.8, epodes 3.7–8, 5.43; Ps.-Acro ad epodes 3.8, 5.25, 17.50)? What does her name imply (leading possibilities: *canities*, old age, Düntzer, 1892: 597–613; *canis*, the dog's/iambic's bitter bile, Call. fr. 380 Pf; *canere*, "to sing;" *Canicula*, the scorching dog-star, Oliensis: 1998: 69–72; other options: χηνιδεύς, gosling, an ill-omened bird, or κενὸν εἶδος, empty shape, Mankin, 1995: 300)? Should Canidia be read more as a metaphor: impotence, sexual and literary (Gowers, 1993: 285–290; Oliensis, 1998: 68–77); the old Rome that is dying and giving way to new powers (Anderson, 1972: 9–13); the perversion of the Roman ordered class system (Oliensis, 1998: 80)? I must confess; I am an agnostic. The controversy on Canidia can be distracting. When you are about to be buried up to your neck, you may be asking why this is happening (*quid … quid*, 5.3–4) and wondering if there is any divine sense of justice (*At, o deorum quidquid in caelo regit*, 5.1), but you have no question about the character of your assailant. For sure, she is very real and perverse. It probably does not matter much whether she is an old unkempt black-tooth (as Horace describes Canidia) or a younger seductress (like Medea). What matters is what helps you escape, such as, "Can I appeal to her sense of motherhood?" To mythologize Canidia,

innocent noble boy to collect his parts for an even stronger love potion to win Varus away from a rival spell, courts no sympathy. Throw her and her rage out—or can you?[50]

Canidia spreads her fury. According to Horace's own language/word choice, the character in this witchy poem that personifies the Lykambid iambic mentality is not Canidia or not just Canidia:

'At, o deorum quidquid in caelo regit
  terras et humanum genus,
quid iste fert tumultus? aut quid omnium
  vultus in unum me truces?
per liberos te, si vocata partubus
  Lucina veris affuit,
per hoc inane purpurae decus precor,
  per improbaturum haec Iovem,
quid ut noverca me intueris aut uti
  petita ferro belua?' (epode 5.1–10)

But really, by every god in heaven, who rules over the earth and the human race, what is behind your sudden attack? Or why are all savagely staring at me alone? You, by your children, if ever Lucina answered your prayer and attended as you gave birth, by this empty noble purple robe, I pray, by Jupiter, who will assuredly censure these acts, why are you like a stepmother watching me or like some beast the armed hunter stalks?

The first speaking part belongs to the young boy, Canidia's victim (1–10), which requires the audience from the outset to see the situation via his words and identify with his perspective. The child is bewildered and can only frame his prayer as three extended, stammering questions. He does not know his assailant. His witness list (children; his noble toga; Jupiter, 5–8) indicates he hopes his attacker is a pious noble matron, while the corresponding condition and questions reveal he suspects all along that he has fallen victim to some child-hating witch (*si … Lucina affuit*) or a

as if she were some well-named *Harry Potter Valdemort* and/or to interpret her as an abstract symbol lessens her terror within the drama and subsequently keeps the rage in her assailant's counter-curse at a safe distance. This boy wants Canidia to suffer and die. The impact of epode 5 depends on the willingness to confront Canidia from the boy's perspective.

[50] The horrific repels and attracts. Leontius the son of Aglaion, making his way from the Peiraeus back to Athens along the north wall, could not keep from staring at the dead bodies exposed near the place of public execution (Pl. *R.* 439e–440a). Lucius is transformed into an ass, because he cannot resist spying on and experiencing Pamphile's magic (Apul. *Met.* 3.19–24).

"step-monster" (*noverca*).[51] His balanced but impassioned rhetoric fits a character trying to react as calmly as possible to a terrifying attack. Then, an outside narrator breaks in to summarize: the boy trembles and everything about him is soft (*impube corpus, quale posset impia / mollire Thracum pectora*, 13–14). Fear triumphs.

When the boy regains his voice for a longer closing speech (87–102) after Canidia's incantations, he has been changed by her attack. His words have hardened, which the narrator signals by negating the first description of him: *sub haec puer iam non, ut ante, mollibus / lenire verbis impias* (83–84, cf. 13–14). Now the lad has given up on pleading and instead curses (*diris* ***agam*** *vos*, 89a) with the precise language that Horace uses to define the Archilochean-Lykambid invective disavowed in *Epistle* I.19.19–25 (... *ut mihi saepe / bilem, saepe iocum vestri movere* ***tumultus!*** / ... *non res et* ***agentia*** *verba Lycamben*). Looking backwards from the epistle to the epode, the only indication that the boy would experience such a quick and absolute shift in character from the passive (*mollibus* ... *verbis*) to the aggressive (*diris*) is his very first question (*quid iste fert* ***tumultus?***, 3).[52] Such outrages (*tumultus*) merit retaliation, which

[51] This boy talks like a grown-up, schooled in the ways of witches. He raises the possibility that Canidia has children (Pactumeius, epode 17.50–52, and the unnamed daughter of *C.* I.16 [Tyndaris of *C.* I.17?, Sturtevant, 1912: 119–122; Hahn, 1939: 223–225]), but he smartly qualifies the oath he swears by her children. He recognizes that not every woman practicing sorcery is a barren old hag (Medea). Nonetheless, if this witch does have children, he questions the legitimacy of the birth (*si* ... *partubus /* ... *veris*, vv.5–6). Witches, at times represented as the evil screech owl or a kind of vampire (cf. Plin. *H.N.* 11.232; McDonough, 1997: 315–344), were known to steal children, especially early in their infancy when most vulnerable, and others physically weak (e.g., the story of Proca, Ov. *Fasti* 6.131–168; Petr. *Satyr.* 63.8; Plin., *H.N.* 7.16–18, 28.39; Erictho cuts babies from their mother's bellies so that she can burn them on her altars, Luc. *Phars.* 6.557–558; Aristomenes, accosted by the witches Meroë and Panthia, is as helpless as a newborn baby: *At ego, ut eram, etiam nunc humi proiectus inanimis nudus et frigidus et lotio perlutus, quasi recens utero matris editus*, Apul. *Met.* 1.14; cf. the myth of the midwife-witch, Harley, 1990: 1–26; child-killing demons, Johnston, 1995: 361–387). Witches, then, by common lore were considered antithetical to motherhood. The example cited to substantiate this practice in the time of Horace concerns a witch kidnapping a slave-child (*CIL* VI 19747); Canidia, however, does not even have regard for the *toga praetexta* and its purple stripe, which was supposed to ward harm from the citizen child (N.-H., 1978: on II.18, v.8). The statement on Canidia's "supposed" child Pactumeius (see on epode 17 *infra*) is so sarcastic that it is tempting to read the boy's condition as also disingenuous. Whether or not *C.* I.16 addresses Canidia is hotly contested (see Chapter 5 on *C.* I.16), and the identification of Canidia's *filia* as Tyndaris is not secure. Odds are that Canidia had no children, unless she stole them, and the boy knew it.

[52] Horace's lad knows his Archilochus: his first two lines follow Archil. 177 W: ὦ Ζεῦ, πάτερ Ζεῦ, σὸν μὲν οὐρανοῦ κράτος, / σὺ δ' ἔργ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ὁρᾷς.

Horace's reaction to his imitators in epistle 19 confirms (*bilem*, *saepe iocum*); but, in the witchy circumstances of epode 5, there is only *bile* no *joke*.

Canidia's assault motivates the boy to gain vengeance. He is transfigured by the witches' incantations into the character of Archilochus against Lykambes, as is reflected by the language he uses. By giving the boy over to the specific nature of the iambic Horace disavows, the narrator obfuscates the character of the boy. Of course, he is the victim and rightly earns sympathy through his helplessness and innocence in the face of witches burying him alive. From this vantage point the transformation of the soft boy into the cursing victim is well justified, and it would be most out of place, an injustice in fact, if he did not gain some measure of vengeance through condemning the witches to death. In this sense the young man's first question by the end of the epode reads as a justification for hard invective. *Quid iste fert tumultus*—"What is the result of that kind of outrage?" The result is retaliation in kind. The witches deserve a verbal scourging (cf. *S.* I.3.117–119). Justified as the boy is in his reaction, Horace's later disavowal of this Lykambid-Archilochean iambic temperament provokes a hard question. How tainted is the boy by rage? Just because we want the witches dead too, should we appreciate what the boy has become because of his retaliation against Canidia's witchy hostility? He imagines himself as a hostile, horrific character—a nighttime Fury and ghastly shade perched on the chests of his enemies (*nocturnus occurram Furor … umbra curvibus unguibus*, 92–93). He promises that the wolves and birds will tear apart the witches limb from limb, which is what he would do if he had the chance. The boy becomes a "vicarious cannibal," so that there is hardly any difference between himself and his assailants.[53] Horace is presenting within this conceptualization of iambic a dreadful cycle of vengeance: an aggressor transforms the victim into an aggressor, who punishes the aggressor/now victim, who then may retaliate further. This cycle is depicted by Canidia and her beloved Varus (67–82). Canidia tries to drug Varus into love; he resists; she makes a stronger potion; before you know it an innocent boy is pulled into the fight and ends his life cursing. In this story of aggression and rage, all innocence is lost and the ending is a complete tragedy.

---

[53] "Vicarious cannibal" is Redfield's designation (1975:199). Achilles' rage over Patroclus' death induces him to wish he could devour the dead Hector (Hom. *Il.* 22.346–347; cf. Worman's discussion, 2008: 30–35, on the *cannibalistic warrior*). Cf. epode 16.20: the iambist eventually leaves Rome to the prowling wolves.

When the boy breaks the silence, he comes closer to agreeing with Canidia than could ever be imagined at the beginning of the epode,

> sed dubius unde rumperet silentium[54]
> misit Thyesteas preces:
> 'venena miscent fas nefasque, non valent
> convertere humanam vicem.' (5.85–88)
>
> But hesitating how he should break the silence, he hurled Thyestean curses: "poisons mix right and wrong, they are not strong enough to change human vengeance."[55]

and since the audience is predisposed to sympathize with the child's plight and subsequently recognize the justice in his curse, Horace can prepare them through the boy's opening speech to hate the witch as intensely as the boy, to retaliate, and embrace rage themselves. Vengeance becomes their bond, and therefore, Canidia's prayer, at the poem's dead center, encapsulates everyone's wish:

> Nox, et Diana, quae silentium regis
> arcana cum fiunt sacra,
> nunc, nunc adeste, nunc in hostilis domos
> iram atque numen vertite! (51–54)
>
> "Night and Diana, ruler of the silence when secret rites take place, now, now grace our spells, now turn anger and power against the homes of our enemies."

---

[54] The poetic expression *rumpere silentium* (only before in Lucr. 4.583 and Verg. *A.* 10.63–64) brings to mind the ending of Horace's satire on Canidia. It is as if the narrator of the epode, sensing the explosion that is coming from the boy, tries to lighten the mood with a coy reference to the fig tree's mocking fart at Canidia and Sagana, *S.* I.8.44–47. There is nothing in epode 5 that requires it to be written before *S.* I.8. Compare Fraenkel (1957: 62–63), who argues without explanation that epode 5 was written first.

[55] The couplet 87–88 is difficult: editors agree only that the manuscript reading *venena magnum* defies sense. For a complete critical review, see Watson (2003: 243–245). At the heart of the debate is whether poison can overturn divinely sanctioned right and wrong and not have the power to do the same for retribution on the human level. Those who think that divine law should not be contradicted typically supply a negative in the first line of the couplet, such as Haupt's (1852) "maga non" (defended by Kraggerud, 2000: 80–88). Otherwise, "miscent" provides good sense (Garnsey, 1907: 30; Giangrande, 1967: 327–328). I would add in defense of "miscent" that the iambist labels the boy's curse Thyestean, a myth that epitomizes a cycle of vengeance that quickly stops discriminating between right and wrong, who was the perpetrator and who the victim. Poison works regardless. This is the point made by the transformation of the boy into the personification of Lykambid iambic. The power in vengeance to destroy clear boundaries between right and wrong between attacker and attacked explains why Horace may have composed the lines so that *fas nefasque* and *humanam vicem* are nearly in apposition.

Verbal revenge, rage-infection rules. It does not allow idle spectators.[56]

The infection continues spreading. The plot-line from epode 5 recurs in the structural frame of epode 6, an animalistic iambic in which the outside observer (audience) becomes a prime player in retaliatory anger:

> Quid immerentis hospites vexas canis
> ignavus adversus lupos? (epode 6.1–2)
>
> Why harass the innocent guests, you dog, sluggard when facing wolves?

> agam per altas aure sublata nives
> quaecumque praecedet fera: (epode 6.7–8)
>
> On through the deep snows with pricked ear I will stalk whatever beast flees out in front.

> an, si quis atro dente me petiverit,
> inultus ut flebo puer? (epode 6.15–16)
>
> Or, if someone with black bite attacks me, will I unavenged weep like a boy?

The opening question could be prefixed to the boy's lament as his first words in epode 5 and that epode would read just as well: "Why, you dog, are you harassing the innocent?" Then, Horace centers epode 6 (vv.7–8) on the promise of retaliation in words that echo the boy's curse (*agam*, v.7; cf. *diris agam vos*, 5.89a), transforming him into a beast-like Fury (*petamque vultus umbra curvis unguibus*, 5.93), a terror matched in this iamb by assailants becoming animals and facing off against one another: dogs, wolves, wild beasts, and bull. Lastly, the closing question with its witchy black toothy bite (6.15–16; cf. *hic irresectum saeva dente livido / Canidia rodens pollicem*, 5.47–48) would make a good scholiast's note scribbled at the end of epode 5. The conflict in both epodes is roughly the same except for one significant alteration. Again someone has attacked an innocent, but on this occasion the counter-attack is not made by the innocent themselves but a more formidable and commanding outside observer:

---

[56] Cf. Seaford (1994: 25–29) on the cyclical nature of vengeance. In the act of revenge one group may find a renewed sense of identity and cohesion, but this only intensifies the hostility. Therefore, revenge represents the "danger of uncontainable perpetuation of conflict," which in turn is contained by "friendly" reciprocities (e.g., gift exchange, exile and a new beginning in another household, and judicial restraint). When Horace constructs iambic as reciprocal song, he is containing its potential for hostility (see Chapters 3 and 4).

quin huc inanis verte, si potes, minas
   et me remorsurum pete. (epode 6.3–4).[57]

You had better turn your empty threats here, if you are able, and assail me, who will bite you back.

What turns this iambic spectator into a protagonist is that the first assailant, the original dog in this case, does not play his role properly. He not only threatens the weak without just provocation, he proves so cowardly and soft that he runs from wolves and does not bother tracking down his own prey. All bark and no bite, this iambic dog, completely domesticated, waits on his master for his dinner (*tu, cum timenda voce complesti nemus, / proiectum odoraris cibum*, 9–10). Maecenas could ask this watchdog, "What good to me is your work, since you are unfit for conflict and weak (*tuum labore quid iuvem meo / imbellis ac firmus parum*, epode 1.15b–16)?" The spectator takes the opposite stance. He presents himself as the essential iambist (*agam*), an animal in human guise (6.5–7a; 11–14):

nam qualis aut Molossus aut fulvus Lacon,
   amica vis pastoribus,
agam . . .

cave, cave: namque in malos asperrimus
   parata tollo cornua,
qualis Lycambae spretus infido gener
   aut acer hostis Bupalo.

For as either the Molossian or tawny Laconian, the shepherds' strong allies, I will hunt you down . . . Be on your guard, on your guard: for I have my hard-hitting horns at the ready, poised against the wicked, just as if I were the son-in-law of lying Lykambes and Bupalus' ferocious enemy.

The parallel comparatives (*qualis . . . aut . . . aut*) equate the natural world with the human, animals with iambists, and the simile offers a pointed interpretation for the iambic temperament critiqued within the scope of Horace's *Epodes* and disavowed in *Epistle* I.19. Here is the Lykambes-Archilochean and Bupalus-Hipponactean perspective via Horace: animal instincts to protect territory and defend ownership symbolize primal human motivations for blame and vengeance. The best that you can

[57] S.B. prints Fabricius' "verte, si potes" [si potes, verte δφψV: si potes, vertis *cett.*]. I agree. The imperatives fit the speaker's mood (*cave, cave*, v.11) and *verte* mid-verse coordinates better with *et . . . pete*.

hope for in "words that hunt down" (*agentia verba*) is that the attacks are justified: that the dogs will be the shepherds' loyal friends (vv.5–6).[58]

By the time the spectator/antagonist ends his threat, his final question can only be rhetorical (15–16). Attacked, he will attack back. He will not weep like a boy. His words, "like an unavenged child" (*inultus ut … puer*, v.16), evoke the same level of understanding that could be felt for the noble boy, who grew up fast and cursing, when he discovered his innocence would not protect him. That boy, hesitating over how to break the silence and secret rites Canidia had enacted (*silentium*, epode 5.51, 85), launched Thyestean curses. This iambist is clearly on that boy's side, and his assumption that the reflex to retaliate is the only reasonable adult-option pushes the external audience to feel the same. No one should expect any target merely to stand down. In fact, if the weaker cannot answer for themselves, then the stronger can do so on their behalf. To define iambic as the natural instinct for vengeance turns it into a Thyestean curse, where the cycle of retaliation is prone to infect others and cannot be ended without death. This is blood vendetta that leads to madness: Atreus—Thyestes—Thyestes' sons—Agamemnon—Iphigenia—Clytemnestra—Orestes—Furies. Res-

[58] The dog is an ambivalent figure, capable of good and bad behavior: a trusted companion and guardian or a rapacious, greedy menace (Lilja, 1976: 126–129; Rose, 1979: 215–230; Harriott, 1982: 9–17; Watson, 1983b: 156–159, 2003: 251–252; Burnett, 1994: 152–155; Graver, 1995: 43–44; Houghton, 2004: 300–301). Any predatory animal, known for violent attacks, becomes a ready symbol for retaliatory rage (the fox and the eagle, Archil. frr. 172–181, 224 W; the fox and monkey, Archil. frr. 185–187 W; the ant, Archil. fr. 23.14–16 W). Jesus warns his followers, "I am sending you like lambs into a pack of wolves. So, be wise as snakes and as innocent as doves" (Mt. 10:16). Compare the opposite: the toothless opponent is Horace's domesticated dog on the prowl for table scraps, epode 6.9–10, or an enemy lying flat on his face like a tired-out dog, Hippon. [Archil. ?] fr. 115 W; cf. Watson, 1983b: 156–159. When Horace likens the blame poet to a dog or a bull (also at *S.* I.4.33–35: *omnes hi metuunt versus, odere poetas. / 'faenum habet in cornu; longe fuge. dummodo risum / excutiat, sibi non, non cuiquam parcet amico*), he follows Hellenistic precedent primarily, although earlier Pindar, *P.* 2.52–53, refers to Archilochus' deep bite, δάκος ἀδινὸν, without specifying the beast (cf. Steiner, 2001: 154–158); cf. *Leon. A.P.* 7.408.3–4; Callim. *Aet.* fr. 380 Pf.; *Iamb* 4.101–102a; *Iamb* 13.52–53a Pf.; Pfeiffer's parallels (*Iamb* 4. n. 101) on humans displaying "bullish" anger show that the iambist as bull is only another example of a common comparison, human to animal behavior (E. *Med.* 92, 188; Ar. *Ra.* 804; Pl. *Phdr.* 117B; Nic. *Al.* 222). For Horace, precedent, be it Hellenistic or earlier, likely mattered little compared to the semantics of the names, ***Bu**palus* (βοῦς) and ***Lyk**ambes* (λύκος); see Watson, 2003: 263–264, nn.12, 13–14. Consequently, I see less of a problem in Horace's shift in metaphor from dog to bull (vv.9–11). Horace is creating an animal kingdom—dogs, wolves, bulls—that depicts the potential for outrage and vengeance, existing by nature, within the Archilochean-Lykambid iambic tradition.

olution requires domination, demanding warfare, which harmonizes with Augustus' explanation for his motives in the civil war and renders his actions entirely predictable, a consequence of instinct:

> Qui parentem meum trucidaverunt, eos in exilium expuli iudiciis legitimis ultus eorum facinus, et postea bellum inferentis rei publicae vici bis acie. (*RG* 2)
>
> My parent's murderers, them I forced into exile, taking vengeance on them by legal right, and later, when they made war on the Republic, I defeated them in battle twice.

Lykambid Rome (Epode 7)

The iambic drama that Horace presents and its plot-line—the infectious nature of discontent and discord (epodes 1–6)—preview an invective against Rome's propensity for civil bloodshed (epode 7). In epodes 1–6 the iambist casts blame in a variety of guises, aggravating the social divisions within Roman society: *amici* (patron/partisan, epode 1, 3); city loan-shark/independent countryman (epode 2); noble/freedman/slave (epode 4); old witch/innocent noble boy (epode 5). Each disruption brings more players into the cycle of frustration and rage, until in epode 6 the distinctions between aggressor, victim, and spectator become hard to maintain. In epode 7 determining such exclusive categories becomes impossible, since all are enveloped in open civil war. Each is simultaneously the violated and violator. Suddenly now the iambist, while he is building his story to a logical, predetermined end, cannot suppress, when the climactic moment arrives, his own shock at the depth of Rome's calamity:

> Quo, quo scelesti ruitis? aut cur dexteris
> aptantur enses conditi? (1–2)
>
> furorne caecus[59] an rapit vis acrior
> an culpa? responsum date.
> tacent et albus ora pallor inficit
> mentesque perculsae stupent.

[59] S.B., citing Bentley (1711: ad loc.) and Brink (1982b: 38–39; see his list of supporting editors) prints *caecos* [*Romanos*], the reading of the deteriores. The majority reading *caecus* should be retained. *Furor* … *caecus* … *vis* (13–14) form a tragic sequence rather than two or three distinct, unrelated alternatives (Carrubba, 1966: 31–34, against Page, 1883: ad loc.). Romulus' act of murder (*culpa*, 14: *scelusque fraternae necis*, 18) angers the fates (*vis acrior*, 13: *acerba fata*, 17), who send madness to exact retribution (*furor*,

sic est: acerba fata Romanos agunt
scelusque fraternae necis,
ut immerentis fluxit in terram Remi
sacer nepotibusque cruor. (13–20)

To where, where, you miscreants, are you rushing? And why do you ready in your right hands swords hidden?

Is blind madness or a more pressing power forcing you on, or guilt? Answer me! They answer nothing—their faces turn ashen white and their minds reel dumb-struck. That is the way it is then: bitter fates drive the Romans, and the crime of brother murdering brother, ever since there flooded onto the ground innocent Remus' blood, a curse upon his children's children.

It is a common Horatian tactic to open a poem with a question framing his argument, either a single question, double, or an extended series, that through hyperbole conveys impatience or desperation. Therefore, the anguish expressed here has a familiar ring (*quid hoc veneni in praecordiis? / num viperinus … cruor / … fefellit, an malas / Canidia tractavit dapes?*, epode 3.5–8; *quid iste fert tumultus? aut quid omnium / vultus in unum me truces?*, epode 5.3–4; *Quid immerentis hospites vexas canis / ignavus adversus lupos?*, epode 6.1–2). This particular interrogation, however, is Horace's most immediate and emotive anadiplosis (*Quo*, *quo*), which after only six pulses of verse he augments with *aut cur?*.[60] These initial questions in epode 7 position the iambist as the audience, watching a disaster that has passed beyond his creative control. He is an antecedent for Juvenal, who, standing on Rome's street-corners, finds it impossible not to write his satire (1.30). The horror of Horace's rhetorical questions

---

13: *sacer nepotibus cruor*, 20). *Furor caecus*, in the manner of a Greek tragedy, acts as an outside force attacking and infecting the guilty with its personality (cf. the cursing boy, epode 5.91–92: *quin, ubi perire iussus exspiravero, / nocturnus occurram Furor*). *Sic est* (17), then, joins vv.13–14 to their fuller explanation in vv.17–20.

[60] Cf. Horace's opening questions: single (*S.* I.1; II.4, 8; epodes 6, 9; *C.* I.9, 24, 29; II.7, 11, 17; III.7, 20, 28); double (*S.* II.2; *C.* I.5, 31; III.8; IV.14; *Epist.* I.4); series (epodes 5, 12; *C.* I.8, 12; III.19, 25; *Epist.* I.3, 11, 15). Horace uses an opening anadiplosis sparingly, a total of six times (epodes 7, 17; *C.* I.13; II.14; IV.1, 13): half at line-end (*C.* I.13; II.14; IV.1); three with a name (Telephus, I.13; Postumus, II.14; Lyce, IV.13). The only examples in the first words of a poem are *C.* I.38 combined with III.1 (*Persicos odi … odi profanum*), and epode 7 (*Quo, quo*) and 17 (*Iam, iam*). Only epode 7 is a question. Horace could have used a first-position anadiplosis effectively in the Bacchus Ode (III.25), when he is being carried away with the god's inspiration (*Quo me, Bacche, rapis tui / plenum?*), but passes on the opportunity. The curse against Lyce (*Audivere, Lyce, di me vota di / audivere, Lyce …*, *C.* IV.13.1–2) comes the closest to reproducing the stammer that begins epode 7; on the harsh nature of the attack against Lyce, see Johnson (2004b: 168–174).

is that we catch the iambist himself caught looking on at those around him, as they fit swords to their hands and rush off for who knows where, to do who knows what. The iambist is left screaming questions.[61] What the iambist/audience lets us (the remote audience) know first is that he for sure is observing criminal (*scelesti*) behavior and cannot intervene to stop it.[62]

Grasping sheathed swords by the hilt and weighing them in the hand ready for use can signal that a warrior is recovering lost or forgotten strength.[63] Against the expectations of the motif, Horace preemptively labels this display of martial *bravado* in epode 7 sinister. He manages a mere two syllables before he calls those he watches, "wicked" (*scelesti*). Outside of the comedians, *scelestus* is not often used for people. Cicero in his invective never uses the word seriously against any person; Sallust directly for a person only twice (*Cat.* 51.32; 52.15).[64] Horace three times calls someone *scelestus/a*: Phyllis' supposed low-born parents (*C.* II.4.17); criminals whom punishment always overtakes (*C.* III.2.31); the Danaids who murder their husbands (*C.* III.11.39)—the very women whose statues lined the portico of the temple of Apollo, built to celebrate Octavian's

[61] Compare Ascanius' first cry to the Trojan women, burning their own ships: *"quis furor iste novus? quo nunc, quo tenditis" inquit / "heu miserae ciues? non hostem inimicaque castra / Argivum, vestras spes uritis"* (Verg. *A.* 5.670–672a).

[62] Harrison (2001: 178) captures the mood: "Epode 7 elicits only despair and fatalism from its audience, apparently resigned to national disaster . . ."; also Porter (1995: 115–117).

[63] Horace playfully imagines that he could become more Lucilian and draw the sword of his satires, whenever he is attacked (*S.* II.1.34–46). Tolkien's Gandalf advises the cursed old king Theoden, who has nearly succumbed to Grima Wormtongue whispering the king's youthful might has past, that Theoden's fingers will remember their old strength better, if they grasp a sword-hilt.

[64] Sallust gives a memorable example, while describing Catiline's murder of his stepson to make way for a marriage to the disreputable Aurelia Orestilla (*pro certo creditur necato filio vacuam domum scelestis nuptiis fecisse*, *Cat.* 15). On Horace (epodes 7 and 16) imitating Sallust's style, see K.-H., 1884/1958: *praef.*; Barwick, 1944: 64–67; Krämer, 1965: 363 n.77; Nisbet, 1984: 4–6, 8. Plautus and Terence commonly used *scelestus/a* for cursed persons (Plaut. *Bacch.* 783–784; *Merc.* 190, 203; *Most.* 504, 532; *Ps.* 354–356; Ter. *And.* 790; *Eun.* 71, 668, 944; *Heut.* 970), but this practice did not continue in the classical period. Besides Sallust (*supra*), see Quint. 2.16.2 (*eloquentiam esse quae poenis eripiat scelestos*). Cicero (*Att.* 6.1.8.15) writes the adverb sarcastically in his own defense (*tu sceleste suspicaris, ego* ἀφελῶς *scripsi*). Roman authors on the whole preferred *sceleratus*, which was used more of things than people and became more popular among post-classical authors. In Horace, *scelestus/a*: *scelus* frequently retain the old connotation of hereditary guilt (*scelesti* . . . *scelusque fraternae necis*, vv.1, 18; *C.* I.2.29, 3.39; III.11.25; Wagenvoort, 1956: 174, also citing Verg. *Ecl.* 4.13).

ultimate victory in the civil wars.[65] The iambist is not mincing words. He stares down the civil onslaught and calls it what it is (*scelesti*)—vengeance, murder, retribution for guilt—and like a good prosecutor he goes to work convicting the perpetrators of their immorality.

Horace gives the "you" at the head of the epode wide coverage, Latin and Roman (with a shift between the plural and singular: *ruitis*, 2; *Latini*, 4; *Romanus*, 6; *Romanos*, 17), so that the opening question, *Quo, quo scelesti*, indicts all of Roman society together without discrimination: the leaders, their partisans, every descendent of Romulus. However dangerous it might have been to include the most powerful, Octavian, Anthony, or Sextus Pompeius, within the invective, while the outcome of the conflict was still in doubt or in its aftermath, Horace leaves the charge completely open. His invective works against any specificity and achieves a universal application. It defies any definite time and space, other than the general anguish that seeks some explanation for the madness of civil violence.[66] The only time Horace defines is one of duration: Roman slay-

[65] The myth of the Danaids was a popular theme in Augustan poetry and iconography (see Nisbet and Rudd, 2004: 150–153).

[66] Without sacrificing a sense of timelessness (see also Fraenkel, 1957: 56), Horace leaves room to read between his opening four lines specifics in the civil wars between Sextus Pompeius and the triumvirs Antony and Octavian (42–36 BC). Rome's warring generals touted special relationships with particular deities for political advantage (for a listing of the generals and their gods, see Johnson, 2004b: 58–59, 233 nn.30–31). Horace's relatively rare metonymy *Neptuno super* (v.3; Watson, 2003: 273) tags Sextus Pompeius, who proclaimed himself the son of Neptune (Cass. Dio 48.19.2; on the epigraphical and numismatic evidence for *Neptunus Pompeius*, see Taylor, 1931: 120–121; Gowing, 1992: 309–310; Osgood, 2006: 204). The negotiations for the Treaty of Misenum (39 BC) took place on land and sea. Temporary piers were built, one for Antony and Octavian landward and another for Pompeius seaward. When the first negotiations failed, the final settlement was brokered on a mole near Puteoli with Antony/Octavian stationed on land and Pompeius aboard ship (App. *BC*. 5.8.71–72). No one expected the peace to last. The guests attending the celebratory banquets carried concealed daggers just in case (καὶ οἱ περὶ τὸ δεῖπνον αὐτὸ ἀφανῶς εἶχον ὑπεζωσμένα ξιφίδια, App. *BC*. 5.8.73; cf. Horace's *enses conditi*, v.2). On the Parthian threat (vv.9–10) during these years (40–38 BC), see *infra*. This spread of years (42–36 BC) in Horace's look backward to previous civil war allows for contentious guessing whether the plunge into civil ruin, *Quo, quo scelesti ruitis?*, relates to various stages in the triumviral wars with Pompeius (41 BC: Giarratano, 1930: 61; 39/38 BC: K.-H., 1884/1958: *praef*; Sellar, 1892: 123; Ableitinger-Grünberger, 1971: 60–65; Setaioli, 1981: 1710–1712; Nisbet, 1984: 6–7; Watson [*JRS*, 1988: 227–228] in his review of Kraggerud, and later, 2003: 267, 269–271; Cávarzere, 1992: 163–164; DeVivo, 1994: 39–58) or the events leading to Actium (34–32 BC: Plüss, 1904: 46–47; Campbell, 1924: 144; Kraggerud, 1984: 65 n.34; Mankin, 1995: 6, 143; cf. Thom's bleak view, 2000: 46 n.29, which seems to fit the later date). Garnsey (1907: 17), anticipating Kraggerud's suggestion that the *scelesti* are the Antonians, dates the epode post-Actium. Nisbet (1984: 8–10) offers the intriguing theory, that Horace composed epodes 7 and 16 in the years 39–

ing Roman ever since Romulus killed Remus in the founding of Rome. By tradition Archilochus lived in the same time period as Romulus and Remus. If so, then the Romans have been involved in a cycle of anger and vengeance ever since the time of Archilochus against the Lykambids. Now rage and revenge have taken control.

In all fairness to Rome, when the iambist rehearses her enemies (Carthage, Britain, and Parthia, 5–10), there are instances of justifiable warring. Rome burned Carthage, and the iambist's name-calling puts the blame squarely on that city ("haughty citadels," "jealous Carthage;" … *superbas invidae Carthaginis / … arces*, 5–6a). "Untouched" (*intactus*) Britain must face the threat of imperial expansion (7–8). Rome in the past was on the attack against both established and potential threats, but these had repercussions as the iambist presents them. The epode places none other than the Parthians, the paragon for violent genius, in the role of an aggrieved party (*secundum vota Parthorum*, v.9).[67] The Parthians

---

37 BC and that these two invectives had enough negative impact (especially the charge of fratricide, Wagenvoort, 1956: 174–175) that Maecenas brought Horace inside the circle to control him and utilize his talents in the propaganda for Octavian. If so, it becomes harder to explain why Horace's iambic criticism, still including the "damaging" epodes 7 and 16, would be collected and published post-Actium. For Wagenvoort (1956: 170–175), Horace focuses so pointedly on the hereditary guilt of the fratricide that he must have been anti-Octavian, when he wrote the epode (42/41 BC; cf. Thom, 2000: 46). Attempts to explain why epodes 7 and 16 were retained in a collection published soon after Octavian's victory at Actium motivate a small number of more positive readings; e.g., Senay (1982: 153–157) and Kraggerud (1984: 44–65). Watson also seaches for some explanation (2003: 270): "… *Epode* 7 … was retained in the published collection as a salutary reminder of the fate from which Octavian had saved the state …". Decisions on the dating of Horace's poems often depend on how the critic reads patronage, what Horace was allowed to say or not, more than the particular evidence in the texts. Horace even in his later poetry does not trivialize the pains of war and constantly combines in his poetry the competing perspectives of winners and losers to construct a complex approach to political discourse (Johnson, 2004b: xiii–xxiii, on Horace's panagyric praxis).

[67] The iambist presents two exempla for justified war: to retaliate against an enemy (Carthage, 5–6) and to expand the empire (Britain, 7–8). The immediate transition from the triumphant subjugation of Britain to the Parthian curse against Rome (9–10) seems to justify Parthia's fears that they were next. After Britain, Julius Caesar had set his sights on Parthia (Cass. Dio 43.51; 44.15). Caesar's assassination had empowered Octavian, who at the time was studying in Illyria where preparations were on-going for Caesar's Parthian expedition (Suet. *Aug.* 8; App. *BC.* 3.2.9; Cass. Dio 45.3; Plu. *Brut.* 22.2). The Parthians were always restless (n.b. Cicero's concern, which proved to be warranted, as he headed to Cilicia to begin his proconsulship, Cic. *Att.* 5.11.4; *Fam.* 3.3, 15.1.3–5). It is hardly surprising then that, while the Romans were fighting each other, the Parthians did not wait, but under the command of Pacorus and the proscribed republican Q. Labienus invaded and occupied Syria, Cilicia, and territory in Asia Minor all the way to the Aegean Sea (40/39 BC). Ventidius, appointed to the command by Antony, and his eleven legions

curse the Romans and their prayer is granted: the attacking Romans, out of control, turn their swords away from the Parthians and against each other. The problem, as the iambist presents it (this is his invective, after all), is that the cycle of retaliatory rage grows until its violence loses the ability to distinguish friend, one's own people, from foe, the Parthians (cf. *audiet civis acuisse ferrum / quo graves Persae melius perirent*, *C.* I.2.21–22). The ancient ethic of help your friends and harm your enemies falls by the wayside,[68] and so Rome's rage violates standards within the natural world. The iambist grants that there are times when wolves should attack (epode 6), but lions and wolves do not attack their own (7.11–12). Wild animals know better. When the iambist demands an explanation for the madness (7.13–14), he speculates that the Romans acted out of blind fury (*furor caecus*) and he describes them as if they were powerless shades. No mad onslaught now: the Romans fall silent, turn sickly pale, lose all sense (15–16). The invective is reaching its deadly conclusion, signaled in the inability of the target to answer back, when the iambist demands a response (*responsum date*, v.14).

The iambist does not hesitate to break the silence and reach his own conclusion: *acerba fata Romanos* ***agunt*** (17b). The type of vengeful Lykambid iambic that Horace disavows (*non res et* ***agentia*** *verba Lycamben*, *Epist.* I.19.25) has been let loose on the Romans at large by the fates themselves in retaliation for Romulus' unprovoked attack on his brother Remus (*immerentis ... Remi*, 19). The echo of *immerentis* from the opening question of epode 6 (*Quid immerentis hospites vexas canis / ignavus adversus lupos?*), as well as the shared animal imagery just mentioned, weaves together epode 6 and 7 and suggests that the two invectives can be read from a similar perspective. A strong party in epode 6 unjustly attacks the innocent, and another stronger observer intervenes on their behalf. This plot, given without names, takes on specific Roman names and context in epode 7. Romulus kills innocent Remus (*immerentis* and

---

pushed the Parthians back across the Euphrates, but the Parthians did not abandon the campaign until Pacorus was defeated and killed in battle near Mt. Gindarus the following year (Cass. Dio 49.19–23; Plu. *Ant.* 33–34; Debevoise, 1938: 114–120).

[68] Solon 13 W.: ὄλβόν μοι πρὸς θεῶν μακάρων δότε, καὶ πρὸς ἁπάντων / ἀνθρώπων αἰεὶ δόξαν ἔχειν ἀγαθήν· / εἶναι δὲ γλυκὺν ὧδε φίλοις, ἐχθροῖσι δὲ πικρόν, / τοῖσι μὲν αἰδοῖον, τοῖσι δὲ δεινὸν ἰδεῖν (3–6); cf. Pl. *R.* 331e–332c (Dover, 1974: 180–184; Blundell, 1989). It is far worse to be harmed by a friend than a stranger (Arist. *Pol.* 1328a1). Horace ridicules a Maenius (*Epist.* I.15.26–29) for being a common parasite (*scurra vagus*, 28), who, unless he had a dinner, could not differentiate between citizen and enemy (*impransus non qui civem dinosceret hoste*, 29). Compare *N.T.*, Mt. 5.43: Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐρρέθη· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου.

sacer), and the fates, stronger than all, retaliate against the children of Romulus. Cosmic powers have aligned themselves to drive Rome to self-destruction. The fates cannot watch the innocent suffer and are forced to direct rage against Rome. The iambist in epode 7 names the target of his invective twice: *Romanus*, *Romanos* (6, 17). The change from subject to object signals that the Romans have forfeited self-determination. Greek tragedy has come to life, presenting Rome's doom as if she were on stage except in her curse legend is reality.

Epode 7 encompasses more than an exclusive attack on Octavian, Antony, or Sextus Pompeius. The epode makes every Roman a criminal (note the structural assonance: *scelesti, sic est, scelus*) by nature and right of inheritance.[69] And the criminals behave as criminals do. After dispatching their outside enemies, they draw their swords, which should be stored in their sheaths, against each other. I have five brothers whom I love dearly. No word comes to my mind black enough for fratricide as natural instinct. Within the space of seven epodes Horace lets retaliatory rage loose to such an extent that it shreds his own society at the basic level of brother-citizen murdering brother-citizen (*fraternae necis*). Thus, what may be the most insidious form of the madness, the oaths of *amicitia* with all their certitude and necessities, which sound so disarming and inviting in epode 1, play their part in galvanizing the ruin. The iambist pronounces the sentence—*sic est* (17), "That's the way it is!"—and punctuates it with a last word, "blood" (*cruor*).[70]

Γνῶθι Σαυτόν

"I thought Horace said," '*Non Res et Agentia Verba Lycamben*,'
"but the *Epodes* set sail to Actium and civil bloodshed,"
(*Ibis*, epode 1.1—*cruor*, epode, 7.20)

Horace through the first seven epodes progressively challenges societal boundaries by illustrating the infectious nature of aggression and its rage (*res et verba agentia Lycamben*). As it plays out, the beginning of the *Epodes* journeys into an awareness about social divisions and rancor, in which the iambist first involves himself and his friends (epodes 1–3).

---

69 Porphyrio (v.17) summarizes: "sine dubio hoc est: fato agimur ad hoc bellum supplicium pendentes ob caedem Romuli in fratrem admissam."

70 Cf. Horace's final words, *Ars Poetica*: *nisi plena cruoris hirudo*.

Then, as if by rite of passage, he turns and, like Socrates, investigates others: the obtuse upstart slave and the society maligning him (epode 4); the witch who transforms a harmless victim into an enemy full of spiteful curses (epode 5); the cowardly dog bent on attacking the innocent (epode 6); the Romans who rush into battle to kill each other (epode 7). Through this sequence the iambist forms a bond of shamelessness among the most disparate entities from his society so that none are excluded. The lighter moments Horace allows (epodes 2, 3), although they do remind that his iambic cannot be reduced to just "rage," are involved thematically with social division, and so are subsumed into the civil upheaval. How can this level of blame and distress be compared to the mockery in ritual and comedy, as my introduction and opening chapter suggest?

Horace's stratagem is best described as serio-comic. His diverse characters present Rome as a forum or agora characterized by wholesale social mingling with its attendant tensions.[71] This mix parallels a festival-setting. Yet, jests and jabs bring with them questions about what does/should prompt laughter, identified by Rabelais as the "property of man." Horace makes iambic Roman property (*ostendi Latio*; *Latinus / vulgavi fidicen*, *Epist.* I.19.24, 32–33) in the sense that his conception of iambic develops for the Romans a shared involvement, which echoes the exchanges and commonality evident in ritual and comedy (responsion—fusion). Stephen Halliwell (2004: 141) remarks:

> But my position here depends on the general premise that the genre tends strongly towards the (vicarious) comic celebration of shamelessness, providing its audience with opportunities and encouragement to laugh *with* and not simply *at* the shamelessness of its characters. Such comedy, as an argument of Plato's formulates it, invites spectators to take strong, unabashed pleasure in the dramatic representation of laughable behavior of a kind they would be *ashamed to engage in directly* and would, moreover, readily condemn in life (*Republic* 606).[72]

---

[71] Halliwell compares what he names the "agorification" of Athenian public life in Old Comedy (2008: 232–235, 250) to Bakhtin's "carnival." There is present in both an anti-elitism.

[72] "To laugh is to be human, and it is equally human to be laughed at" (Hubbard, 1991: 14). Rabelais defends the power and value of laughter in a ten line epigram before the first book of his *Gargantua* (*Mieulx est de ris que de larmes escrire, / Pour ce que rire est le propre de l'homme.*, vv.9–10); compare Halliwell (2008: 182, 246–252), who posits that in Old Comedy, a festive context, the question about what prompts laughter is irrelevant, because the audience's laughter is irresponsible. I would not go this far in assessing the "institutionalized shamelessness" granted comedians and their audiences (cf. Edwards, 1993: 89–117). To laugh irresponsibly ("consenting participants") still implies an audience aware of the taboos and that they are transgressing them, as

Plato's *Philebus* (48c) locates the laughable (γελοῖον) in madness (ἄνοια) / self-ignorance (ἄγνοια), which Socrates finds fully embodied in the failure to "know yourself," γνῶθι σαυτόν,[73] a saying inscribed at the entrance to the temple of Apollo in Delphi and adopted by Socrates as his creed (Pl. *Chrm.* 164e–165a; *Ap.* 20e–22a, 30d5–31c3, 38a; Paus. 10.24.1). Whoever is prepared to cross over the threshold of Apollo's temple into the presence of the divine, to transgress that boundary, is first advised upon approach to come to terms with what it means to be themselves, and in the process of knowing themselves (the human), they find each other (community) and transcend into the divine.[74] We are prone to conceptualize this experience from our own human vantage point. From our perspective we approach the temple and travel into divine presence. The door of a temple, however, is simultaneously an entrance and exit, or rather an entrance leading in two directions. The ritual experience is not complete until the divine passes back through the door over into the human. The whole act is transgressive, responsive, and transformative: a movement between two supposedly differentiated realms that alters the outlook of the participants.

The *Hymn to Demeter* encapsulates the entire process. Transformation, the recovery from the pain and grief of separation, begins to be realized when the divine Demeter in human guise is willing to cross over the threshold into a human's house. At that moment her divinity shows through her disguise and she regains her sense of well-being in sharing the human-divine experience of fertility and nurture—not

---

Halliwell recognizes (see his interpretation of the *Knights*, 256–259). Laughter within the theater no doubt ran a full range from suppressed to nervous to free (cf. Rosen, 2007: x–xi; Halliwell, 2008: 247). Therefore, behavior attributed to comic targets (and any laughter on the part of an audience at that behavior) may be immune from legal action, but an orator could count on the jury, theater-goers themselves, appreciating, and feeling uncomfortable about, the incongruity involved in laughing at the shameful (see Halliwell's exempla, *Lys.* fr. 53; Heraclitus fr. 15 DK). Horace likewise would assume such questions most relevant, because he is familiar with a history of Greek comedy in which the chorus lost its freedom to blame without restraint (*libertas*) and had to be regulated (*Ars* 281–284; cf. Roman Fescennine verse, *Epist.* II.1.145–155).

[73] The manuscripts read ἄνοια, first emended by the medical writer Cornarius (1561) to ἄγνοια; for discussion of the text and emendation, see Screech (1997: 63–66). Cornarius' ἄγνοια fits Socrates' argument in the *Philebus* that the laughable is exemplified in self-ignorance; consequently, the one is inseperable from the other. Therefore, ἄγνοια, if not the correct reading, is a fine learned gloss for ἄνοια. Hubbard (1991: 2–8) makes the same connection beween the laughable and self-knowledge, when he reviews the types of unknowing characters in Aristophanes' comedies.

[74] The essence of *Divine Comedy* is a paradox: finding god is a journey into one's humanity.

before she smiles and laughs at Iambe's jesting mockery. Then, Demeter in secret begins to purge with fire the mortality from Metanaira's infant son, but when Metanaira out of fear for her child interrupts the goddess, misunderstanding and anger erupt. As a result, the son loses the gift of immortality and the divine is once more divided from the human. Demeter must be placated by gifts, a temple and sacrificial rites. Within the whole of the *Hymn*'s aetiology, iambic mockery plays a part in transcending divisions, but it does not resolve or prevent all tensions.[75] Likewise, the assorted contexts and motivations for laughter and the laughable (ritual / sympotic / dramatic / judicial; aggressive / hostile / jesting / transformative), especially the unease expressed over their comparative worth, reveal conflicts over the precise definitions of "human" and "divine," "mortal" and "immortal," "friend and enemy," and whether or not shame or guilt and their remedies must be experienced to reach some sense of shared understanding about these definitions.[76] The value of iambic invective becomes involved in this on-going debate.

It would be over-reaching to argue that Horace's iambic criticism will settle these questions or that his iambic must be construed as overt ritual (as compared to what I would contend is the nuance or ambiance of ritual).[77] Horace, though, objected to others underestimating his iambic achievement and the degree to which he played the receptions of iambic against each other to introduce a novel effect into its expression (*Epist.* I.19). How Horace constructs the *Epodes* and his iambic criticism suggests (1) that he is particularly aware of the danger in assuming that iambic is properly a mode meant exclusively for rage and domination,

---

[75] Compare "transcending divisions" to the language of Foucault, locating limitlessness beyond limits; *supra*, Introduction. Epodes 1–7, however, could also be summarized as: "Dissolution turns into perversion, and in addition to the antithesis of the lovely virgin comes that of the loving mother, for she too has become a witch, murdering and even eating her children" (Burkert, 1972: 171, on the Agrionia; on the Eleusinian Mysteries, 281–283; the similarity to Canidia, epode 5, is striking: "… the mother or nurse kills the young boy in order to hurt a man, or does so simply in madness," 282). The sacrifice, ritual death, proves a prelude to the new year or new life. For my arguments that Horace understands the ritual context for iambic, see the Introduction and Chapter 1.

[76] Discussions on the definitions of "guilt" and "shame" and how each is encoded within culture should begin with Williams (1993) and include Schneider (1977), Taylor (1985), and Morrison (1996).

[77] Seaford, 1994: 319: "It is worth repeating that we refer here not to the (inaccessible) actual practice of ritual but rather to its representations. These representations, which include myth, take on a life of their own in the acquisition of meanings entirely independent of the actual practice of ritual."

and (2) that he is in general aware of the association of iambic with comedy. On the lighter side, when he heads to the country in an attempt to beat his writer's block, he packs up Archilochus along with the comedians (*S.* II.3.11–12). On the serious side, his own praxis shows that he knew well iambic's reputation for aggression and the anxieties that it induces and exacerbates.

To this point (epodes 1–7), Horace has moved the *Epodes* (*ibis*) to the reality of self-delusion and the risible. He has forced the Romans to know themselves, their warring mentality, what it has and will cost them.[78] Horace presents the Lykambid tradition, which equates iambic with the propensity for enraged vendetta aimed at domination, as an infectious pollutant from which Roman society together needs cleansing.[79] The iambic journey, however, is not even half over. Horace is moving iambic beyond its social rancor (Chapters 3 and 4, epodes 8–17). His mechanism for purification is to transfer to Rome in his iambic/lyric a paradigm for reciprocal song, which by promoting *polyeideia*, continues to discount singing at/against you in favour of formulating song with you.[80]

[78] Burkert concludes his introduction to *Homo Necans* (1972/1983: xxv)—an apt précis also for Epodes 1–7: "The aspects of Greek religion and of humanity that emerge in this study are not those that are particularly edifying, not the ideal or the most likable traits of Greek [Roman] culture. Yet we invoke the Delphic god's injunction that mankind should see itself with absolute clarity, no illusions: Γνῶθι σαυτόν." Compare Foucault's reading of Socrates (2001: 1–19), which associates "knowing yourself" (*gnōthi seauton*) with "care of the self" (*epimeleia heauton*).

[79] This is comparable to an Epicurean outlook: when rage is indulged, it wrecks (Phld. *Ir.* col. xliv.5–35; cf. Briggs, 1970; Barton, 1999) On *miasma*, its definition and signification for societal dangers, see the seminal work by Parker (1983: 1–13), who lists (257–258) civil warring with other disasters (*loimoi*) indicating divine wrath against a community (Th. 7.18.2; A. *A.* 699–705); cf. Hor. epode 7.17; 16.9; *C.* I.2.29–30.

[80] To use Girard's paradigm of the "sacrificial crisis" (1972: 39–67), Horatian song escapes the tragic cycle of violence, because its systematized exchanges allow differentiation.

CHAPTER THREE

RAGE—REPRESSION—RAGE: IAMBIC RESPONSIONS (EPODES 8–15)

deus, deus, nam me vetat
inceptos olim, promissum carmen, iambos
ad umbilicum adducere.
(epode 14.6–8)

I know I long ago promised a song, but now that I have begun these iambics, a god, a god, forbids me to wind it up.

Horace designates his iambics a single *carmen* meant for a one volume scroll, requested presumably by Maecenas, the addressee of epode 14. Two difficulties more than others complicate the argument that the *polyeideia* of the *Epodes* coheres. Horace says that he did not follow the Archilochean-Lykambid approach to iambic after he placed at the near center of his collection a violent sexual invective against a woman (epode 8). If, as I argue, Horace through epodes 1–7 widens the applicability of his iambic, infusing rage into all levels of Roman society, then epode 8 with its personal erotic feuding seems to reverse the process, a startling shift in topic and tone.[1] Second, in the last half of the collection, the iambist not only constantly shifts meters, but also flip-flops from one poem to the next between rage and forms of repression (such as restraint, consolation, submission), as if he cannot determine where iambic should end up.

Given that the précis of Horatian poetic praxis in the *Ars Poetica* places the highest value on unity (*simplex dumtaxat et unum*, 23b), the diversity within the *Epodes*, its point-counterpoint, should contribute to a "oneness," that is, any sense of unevenness would not be a defect but an

[1] "Seems" is deliberate. Richlin (1983: 110) and Porter (1987: 257–258) hint at a slightly different approach when they suggest that epode 8 plays the comic between epodes 7 and 9. The omission of 8 from earlier commentaries (for that discussion, see Ancona, 1994:146 n.1) influenced the interpretation of the *Epodes* for a generation of readers. Epodes 7 and 9 read differently without epode 8 between them.

essential feature in Horace's iambic criticism. Add in how proudly and staunchly he defends his iambic achievement. It is not likely, then, that Horace cannot make up his mind about the value of iambic or finds no value in it at all. Instead, the responsions (back-and-forth) in epodes 8–17 project an intriguing iambic formulation. Set up by the interplay of varied genres, their differing characters, themes, and emotional registers, the responsions undermine the fixed categories underpinning the Lykambid iambic tradition (such as violated / vengeful; criticism / harming), while they argue that the way past iambic's tragic outcome is in comprehending unity out of competing perspectives (συμπλοκή). Thus Horace's iambic aesthetic, far from being an abstract literary game, represents a complexity rather than sameness within society, and as we listen to him testing the dividing lines between various entities, we find ourselves assessing and coordinating the tensions without the differences being removed. For Horace *polyeideia* becomes iambic's prime value, and therefore the outcome of iambic is a joined venture (μέθεξις), as is the case also in ritual experience.[2] Although such rich musicality, theme and variation, will hardly satisfy rigid imitators or prevent Maecenas' complaint that lovesickness delays Horace's iambic production, this is how he winds up iambic and eventually brings it to the scroll.

Keeping Vendetta Down? (Epode 8)

Horace with epode 8 continues testing the value of iambic as vendetta but from a different angle. Because of their sexually explicit attacks, epode 8 and its companion, epode 12, have been singled out as the most notorious examples of biting Horatian invective.[3] Horace finally lets his iambic temper go in just the way a cursory connoisseur of the Archilochean-

---

[2] For definitions and discussion of responsion, συμπλοκή, and μέθεξις, see the Introduction.

[3] K.-H. (1884/1958) *praef.*: "schnöder Abbruch eines Verhältnisses, das dem Dichter leid geworden ist." Fraenkel (1957: 58) tersely: "*Epodes* VIII and XII, with all their polish, are repulsive." Carrubba (1965: 591): "Epodes eight and twelve are companion pieces of savage physical and moral αἰσχρολογία after the most unrestrained manner of Catullus and the Hellenistic poets"; Henderson (1987/1999: 94): "In taking over where Catullus' 'impure mouth' left off ... the 'kiss of genital stimulation, or genital kiss' of *Epode* 8, naturally, has shock value ..." (also Henderson, 1999: 3–16); Gowers (1993: 288): "... the grotesque bodies ... are fleshly versions of the physical ugliness, mordant tone, and unseductive aura of the iambics themselves." And so on through the commentators, including myself. Wilkinson (1945: 46) wins the prize for the most titillating assessment.

Lykambid tradition might expect: an ego-wounded limp-phallic male curses a woman asking the one question she should not (*Rogare longo putidam te saeculo / viris quid enervet meas*, epode 8.1–2). The only thing that grew long is the lifetime (*longo* ... *saeculo*) both spent waiting for the desired erection. If the woman were just to get down to business and give better lip-service, she would have the hard-on she desires (*quod ut superbo provoces ab inguine, / ore allaborandum est tibi.*, 19–20). From this scenario any number of questions can be imagined from either side of the bedroom (*rogare* ["roges"]). *Woman*: "Does this guy think that after he has berated me for having an asshole droopier than a diarrheic heifer that I should just be willing to open up wide?" *Man*: "Does a sexually experienced woman, when faced with a pliant client, really need to act surprised and be told what to do? So suck me hard and I'll *come* through!" This invective *only raises* more questions about the values of rage and vendetta.

The debate will never end (nor should it) over who has the power and the pleasure in this iambic drama, the sucker or the sucked. Horace has managed a difficult dilemma: by imitating a *hard*-hitting Archilochean invective Lykambid-style, he calls into question the value of that iambic temperament. Who exactly is the attacker and attacked in an escalating cycle of hurt, and therefore does violent retaliation ever prove a safe means of resolution? From whichever perspective a reader approaches this invective (from the point of view of the iambist, the woman attacked, or anyone within ear-shot), iambic cuts all ways. And the iambist's assault on the woman plays a howler of a gag not so much on her as on the remote audience listening in from a supposed safe dramatic distance. You just cannot keep this kind of iambic down no matter how hard you try, which goes to show that, while Horace disavows the Archilochean-Lykambid tradition, he does not make his iambic soft or any easier to swallow—all puns intended.

After explaining why Horace never married, when he clearly enjoyed women, Wilkinson surmises that epode 8 provided a release for the author. Those put off by Horace's lurid obscenity often talk in general terms of iambic's moral indignation with such characters and situations; others, who keep their eye on the iambic tradition, tend to speak of the author's pleasure or enjoyment from his obscene obsession. From either perspective readers have a tendency to transfer their own reactions to the poet: "The claim of authorial omnipotence is often a retrojected justification for our own interpretations" (Oliensis, 1991: 126 n.33, cited with approval by Henderson, 1987/1999, 95). To give Horace his due, this confusion results whenever a poet composes compelling verses.

This invective is ultimately about perception or lack of it: the woman's and the audience's. First, the iambist would have us think that this woman does not understand that his "softy" is her fault. She is too old and ugly to arouse him. She has a sick cow's ass and mare's breasts. These lampoons are inventive convention, which compares persons to animals.[4] Semonides' (fr. 7 W) lengthy insult against the woman covers most of the usual comparisons both bad (sow, fox, bitch, ass, weasel, mare, monkey) and good (bee). The monkey-woman is the worst Semonides imagines (71–79),

> τὴν δ' ἐκ πιθήκου· τοῦτο δὴ διακριδὸν
> Ζεὺς ἀνδράσιν μέγιστον ὤπασεν κακόν.
> αἴσχιστα μὲν πρόσωπα· τοιαύτη γυνὴ
> εἶσιν δι' ἄστεος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις γέλως·
> ἐπ' αὐχένα βραχεῖα· κινεῖται μόγις·
> ἄπυγος, αὐτόκωλος. ἆ τάλας ἀνὴρ
> ὅστις κακὸν τοιοῦτον ἀγκαλίζεται.
> δήνεα δὲ πάντα καὶ τρόπους ἐπίσταται
> ὥσπερ πίθηκος· οὐδέ οἱ γέλως μέλει·

> "One from the monkey: this one, quite the deadest loss that Zeus has given us. Ugly face—the whole town sniggers when this sort goes past; short in the neck; in all her movements stiff, fixed legs, no bum. Poor sod, who cuddles that! And like a monkey, she knows all the tricks and tropes, oh yes, but doesn't like a joke. She'd do no good to anyone, but looks and thinks all day how she can do the most harm."[5]

because her ugliness is compounded by her primary flaw: she simply does not comprehend the jokes. She knows the clever tricks, but continues on oblivious the laughter is all about her.[6] She is a trickster, knowing

---

[4] Epodes 6, 7, and 8 are not anomalies within the tradition. Examples include: Archil. 43, 189 W; Phoc. 2 D; Asclep., *A.P.* 5.162 = 8 *HE*; *A.P.* 5.114 [Maec. 1 G.-P. = Phld. 18 Sider]; Phld. *A.P.* 5.107; Bassus of Smyrna *A.P.* 11.72; Lucil. *A.P.* 11.196; Maced. *A.P.* 5.245; Myrin. *A.P.* 11.67; Rufin. *A.P.* 5.76; cf. Hor. *C.* I.25; III.10. See Jeffrey Henderson (1975: 48, 126–129, 131–133) for a catalogue of animals as sexual metaphors in comedy.

[5] I borrow West's translation (1993:18).

[6] I single out the monkey-woman because she personifies best the worst traits, female and male: self-absorption and lack of awareness. Compare Semonides' praise for the bee-woman: of all types she is the wisest and most knowing (πολυφραδεστάτας, v.93). The Kerkopes were transformed into monkeys, "mocking, blaming, like monkeys" (Suda s.v. Κέρκωπες; Κερκωπίζειν; Κερκωπίζοντες [χλευάζοντες, μωκίζοντες, ὡς οἱ πίθηκοι]; cf. Σ Lucian *Alexander* 42.4; Harpocration s.v. Κέρκωψ; Ovid gives the fullest account of this metamorphosis, *Met.* 14.91–100). Given that monkeys can be associated with mockery and blame, and so become types of iambic figures, this connection exposes Semonides' sarcasm when he names the monkey-woman the worst female. She does not understand what by nature she should. Unlike Iambe, she is not "knowing." Likewise,

only how to harm: a type of Archilochean-Lykambid monkey. In this respect, this woman, the butt of every male's iambic laughter, proves herself most un-iambic, since iambic from its infancy presumed a learned female audience who knew how to join in the jests.[7] Horace's woman would make an excellent monkey-woman, ugly in much the same way that Semonides portrays: fat and skinny in all the wrong places and pretending to be rich and learned, when she clearly has no idea, according to the iambist, that the sexual dysfunction is her fault not his. The iambist is more than willing to embrace some hard-hitting raillery at this dense woman's expense.[8]

For both the woman and anyone else listening in, Horace is answering back allegations that he, and by extension his iambic, has grown too weak. After Horace animates iambic by exhibiting its rage in society at large (epodes 1–7), he exposes the iambist to the most vulnerable and personal of situations: (as we listen in) he fails to "get it up" for a lady. So that no one misses the possible comparison to his own satire and

---

self-ignorance is the primary flaw of Horace's woman, as he presents her. Credit goes to David G. Smith for his work on the Kerkopes in his paper, "Xenophanes, the Silloi, and Pindar's Beautiful Monkey" (The Classical Association of the Middle West and South, 2010). Note that Semonides switches the invective at the very end and derides the male. The blameworthy husband, a laughing-stock to his neighbors, is the one who fails to recognize that he has the worst wife.

[7] According to the tradition in the Mnesiepes Inscription (*SEG* 15.517 A [E1], col. 2), Archilochus had to be educated in iambic exchange by learned females. Archilochus, sent on an errand by his father Telesicles to sell a cow, met some women on the way and began to ridicule them (νομίσαντα δ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ἀπιέναι αὐτὰς εἰς πόλιν προσελθόντα σκώπτειν). The women, soon to be revealed as Muses, knew how to respond. They laughed, returned the jests (τὰς δὲ δέξασθαι αὐτὸν μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ γέλωτος), and disappeared leaving a lyre at the boy's feet. Demeter, in deep mourning for her missing daughter Persephone, laughed when Iambe jested with her (Hom. *h.Dem.* 200–205). Catullus thinks his Lesbia more beautiful than the lovely Quintia, because Lesbia possesses the elegance of wit (*totum illud "formosa" nego*: *nam nulla venustas*, / *nulla in tam magno est corpore mica salis.* / *Lesbia formosa est, quae cum pulcherrima tota est*, / *tum omnibus una omnis surripuit veneres.*, c. 86.3–6). *Salis*, especially since it is coupled with *venustas*, refers to more than physical beauty (compare Thomson, 1997: 516). If Varus' little tart were very clever (*non sane illepidum neque invenustum*, c. 10.4), she would catch on to Catullus' brag quickly; compare how Catullus praises Caecilius' mistress for her passionate reaction to Caecilius' *Magna Mater* (*ex eo misellae* / *ignes interiorem edunt medullam.* / *ignosco tibi*, *Sapphica puella* / *musa doctior*, c. 35.14b–17a). Horace sums up the defense for his iambic by admitting that he loves to be read and handled by eyes and hands that know exactly what to do (*Epist.* I.19.33–34). For further consideration of the role of the *docta puella* in lyric and elegy, see James (2003) and Julhe (2004: 107–123).

[8] Cf. Cat. 41; also see epode 10 against Maevius, *infra*.

iambics, he phrases the woman's question about his impotence (***Rogare*** *longo putidam te saeculo, /* ***viris quid enervat meas***, 1–2) with specific language from his readers (*S.* II.1) and Maecenas (epode 1), when they question the strength of his verses:[9]

> 'Sunt quibus in satira videar nimis acer et ultra
> legem tendere opus. *sine nervis* altera quidquid
> composui pars esse putat similisque meorum
> mille die versus deduci posse.' (*S.* II.1.1–4a)
>
> To some I seem too pointed in my satire and to push my work beyond what is legal. Others think that everything I write is floppy and that verses like mine could be produced a thousand a day.

> *roges* tuum labore quid iuvem meo
> imbellis ac *firmus parum*: (epode 1.15–16)
>
> Perhaps you wonder how any labor of mine might help yours, since I am passive and weak?

If we accept the woman's question about sexual impotence as concern over the iambist's literary potency, Horace's counter-attack exploits the audience's iambic ignorance. "If you, the audience, think my iambic has proven to be too *com/*pliant, you have taken me too much at *face* value; you should just interpret me *harder* and see! Take that, you old baggy heifer-asses!" Like a monkey-woman, we know the tricks, but miss the mockery aimed at us. A metapoetic reading does not soften this particular invective.[10] Horace from the beginning of the book allows himself to be questioned as to whether or not he is too mild to be an effective iambist. He puts the question into Maecenas' mouth in epode 1, and now right at the center of the book he sticks the charge directly (not too metaphorically) into the mouth of his audience to ensure that no one

---

[9] Horace explains his departure from writing lyric through the symbol of sexual impotence (see *C.* IV.1.1–8 in Johnson, 2004b: 34–38). Impotence is a common theme in Greek iambic and epigram (Hippon. 78, 92 W; Phld. *A.P.* 5.120, 11.30; Autom. *A.P.* 11.29; Scythin. *A.P.* 12.232; Strat. *A.P.* 12.11, 216, 240); see Watson, 1995: 188–189; 2003: 287–288; McMahon, 1998. The incompatibility of old age and sex is also a well-worn motif, used for both serious and humorous effect (Falkner, 1955: 71–152; Bertman, 1989: 157–171; Esler, 1989: 172–182; Suder, 1992: 228–236).

[10] Clayman (1975: 55–61; 1980: 79–80) justifies Horace's rough lewdness by arguing that this *aischrologia* represents criticism of a overly ornate and "bombastic" archaic literary style rather than expressing a legitimate iambic. Clayman accordingly interprets Horace's invective to be more Callimachean than Archilochean, and the woman is entirely subsumed in metaphor.

misses how genuinely powerful his iambic has grown. The iambist has been asserting all along in the *Epodes* that he does not think his voice weak (*non mollis*):

> an hunc laborem, mente laturi decet
> qua ferre *non mollis* viros?
> feremus, et te vel per Alpium iuga
> inhospitalem et Caucasum
> vel Occidentis usque ad ultimum sinum
> forti sequemur pectore.[11] (epode 1.9–14)

> Or will we pursue this labor with the mind-set that characterizes tough men? We will, and we will follow you, whether over the heights of the Alps and the cruel Caucasus Mountains or all the way to the furthest Western shore, with valiant heart.

Any iambic cowardice results not from the poet but from an audience too reticent to perceive an iambic operating beyond their own stereotypes. To make the point, Horace tags the woman/audience with her/their own accusation by labeling her/them *mollis* nearly dead center in the middle of his attack (epode 8.9a: *venterque mollis*).

Horace maintains his iambic strength all the while he displays the destructive nature of rage within society (epodes 1–7)—but do the contents of this particular invective measure up? Although epode 8 may be shocking to individual tastes, it hardly deserves all the attention given to it as the quintessential expression of unrestrained iambic, at least not in the usual manner that either rejects or relishes its crudity. This iambic ends up being constrained by the predilections of the audience.

The iambist's / male character's situation seems clear enough. He is having a hard time managing an erection and has been questioned by the lady for his failure to perform. The subject enrages him and he lashes out against her. The soft iambist has plenty of hard words: "I would not be having such a *hard* time if you weren't so ugly! You'll just have to suck me *harder*!" His attack, nevertheless, leaves the character of the woman tricky to determine. She could be a prostitute, who is acting

[11] Shackleton-Bailey (1982: 79), following Housman (1882: 192–193), punctuates *viros, … sequemur pectore?*. This shift from the standard punctuation smoothens the lengthy alternative question, since *persequemur* (v.8) does not have to do double-duty and every clause has its own verb (*utrumne … persequemur*; *an … feremus*; *et … sequemur*). Smooth syntax in this case may not be the best editorial goal. The repetitions *laturi … ferre … feremus* and *persequemur … sequemur*, if it is not a gross tautology, indicate Horace is answering his own question, "Yes, I will." Also, the follow-up question that Horace imagines Maecenas asking ("What will your labor be able to accomplish?," 15–16) works best after Horace affirms his commitment to Maecenas.

in a fashion beyond her station, and the male iambist is taking her down a notch by reminding her who she really is. If so, her character parallels Alfius (epode 2) and the slave-now-military tribune (epode 4). The iambist incidentally implies that she is doing quite nicely for herself in plying her trade. She just as easily though could be an adulteress or mistress upon whom the iambist heaps his abuse. He speaks to her as though she were an ugly old prostitute and berates her for her uppity noble 'heirs' in bringing up for discussion his phallic inaction. There is no way to solve this dispute over character. I miss hearing the iambist's voice, "*esto beata*" (v.11). Would it be sarcastic, or at least disingenuous (cf. [Alfius] *beatus*, epode 2.1), and so mark the next lines as invective-fiction against a prostitute/lover playing in high society, or filled with scorn and indignation, imagining the woman as a caricature of high-brow fraud, or some other possibility? Might his voice convey some sigh of pity that would convince us that a noble matron's life has become a pain-filled sham? But voices too can be insincere. Invective is designed to convince rather than represent accurately the target's behavior or looks, because only if an iambist persuades the audience does the attack become accepted. The malignant nature of such iambic attacks distorts reality, if it does not outright lie. This is precisely how Horace makes this iambic so dangerous for the woman/audience. He forces/seduces them into defining roles based on their own perceptions of iambic assault. The audience must choose sides and decide if and to what degree to believe the iambist—in/voluntary performative reaction.[12]

Whatever the exact societal position of the woman, the invective against her is a reaction to a "perceived" attack in which the iambist's

---

[12] Debates about the dramatic situation indicate how successfully the iambic Horace motivates his audience to enjoy creating their own fiction. Who is this woman? Frequently on the short-list: one of Horace's past lovers, given the name Gratidia (Ps.-Acro; Carrubba, 1965: 591–592, reviews the evidence and opinions); a prototypical aging prostitute/woman (K.-H., 1884/1958: *praef.*; Fraenkel, 1957: 58–59; Richlin, 1983:109; Oliensis, 1998: 74–75; Versnel, 1998: 260; Hills, 2005: 33), or a wealthy perhaps promiscuous Roman noble matron (Falkner, 1955: 83–84; Watson, 2003: 293); a personification for Rome herself (Mankin, 1995: 300–301). More recent readers question whether the woman's ugliness first causes the iambist's impotence (Watson, 1995: 188–196; 2003: 288–289) or whether his failure to perform sexually reveals his own iambic apprehensions (Babcock, 1966: 410–419; Schmidt, 1977: 401–423; Oliensis, 1991: 107–138; 1998: 73–77; Fitzgerald, 1988:186–189; Gowers, 1993: 288; McMahon, 1998: 31–32). The iambist would be greatly amused that we care more about the status and symbolic value of the woman than the average penis does. See *S.* I.2.68–71: "What are you thinking? When I rise to fever pitch, do I ever insist on a cunt directly descended from a prestigious consul or one veiled in royal gown?".

anger masks this woman's precise character or motivation.[13] Her question, whether a blatant insult meant to wound, a frustrated complaint, or even genuine concern, brings retaliation justified or not. Thus, the poem belongs to a tradition well established in the Greek iambists and lyricists, namely a curse by an angered lover, couched in the form of abuse against an aged woman. Such attacks typically call the woman ugly, old, compare her to animals, and in general malign her body and ability to arouse sexual desire.[14] This iambist gives us little out of the ordinary or unexpected. He delivers a stereotypic, even if clever, assault that a woman/reader familiar with this particular slice of the tradition would recognize and appreciate for what it is. A *docta puella* would understand the fictions.[15] References to aging often form part of a strategy to

---

[13] Henderson (1999: 10): "... there are *no* 'Hags' here ... these are *bad-mouthed* females, women treated to bad-mouthing, and made to bad-mouth."

[14] Archil. 188, 196a, 206 W; Ps.-Archil. 327, 331 W; Hippon. 84, 135–135b W; Call. 63 Pf. [or Rufin., see *HE*, vol. 2, 214–215]; Mel. *A.P.* 5.204; Maced. *A.P.* 5.233, 271; Rufin. *A.P.* 5.21, 27, 28, 92, 103; Jul. Aegypt. *A.P.* 5.298; Agath. *A.P.* 5.273; Prop. 3.25.11–14; Ov. *Ars* 2.113–120; 3.57–76; *Met.* 15.232–236; *Tr.* 3.7.31–44; Mart. 10.90.1–4. The poets confirm the conventional points of attack by praising their opposites: long dark hair, smooth skin, firm breasts, beautiful eyes, good mind, and fascinating charms (Diosc. *A.P.* 5.56; Phld. *A.P.* 5.13, 121; Mel. *A.P.* 5.140; Rufin. *A.P.* 5.15, 48, 60). Horace's most detailed invectives outside of the *Epodes* take aim at Barine (*C.* II.8) and Lyce (*C.* IV.13). Horace's other invectives, abusing the woman for being old, contrast her to the beauty she once was (e.g., Horace's Lydia, *C.* I.25, and Lyce, *C.* IV.13). Horace ratchets up the brutality of epode 8 when he does not allow for any positive sentiment, not even to say, "You once were beautiful" (also Chloris, *C.* III.15). These exempla are far from exhaustive. Commentators have ransacked the sources trying to identify Horace's model for epode 8; see surveys by Pasquali (1920: 440–442), Fraenkel (1957: 58–60), Mankin (1995:152), Watson (2003: 288–290), and especially Richlin's work (1983:109–116, 127–141; 1984: 67–80) on invectives against women. Versnel (1998: 217–267) reviews some of the more sadistic sources available in magical incantations and curses. The iambist and Canidia speak the same language (see epode 17, Chapter 4). The problem is not that there are so few but so many possible sources. Although most settle on the obscene in early iambic (Mitscherlich, 1800; Orelli, 1837; Müller, 1869; K.-H., 1884/1958; Falkner, 1955: 83–91; Grassmann, 1966: 1–46; Mankin, 1995: 152), the fragmentary leftovers of Archilochus and Hipponax, which are minus most of the explicit details, do not make it easy to judge how indebted Horace might be to them for the particulars of his abuse. Fewer privilege Hellenistic sources and Catullus (Kirn, 1935: 24–27; Perret, 1964: 48; Carrubba, 1965: 591; Newman, 1967: 274; Clayman, 1975: 55–57). Fraenkel's even-handed review includes Greek iambi, comedy, Hellenistic poetry, the Greek epigrams, as well as Catullus and his friends. Philodemus' epigrams, as noted below, deserve mention. We could also throw in the Priapea, if their date could be determined. The diversity and multiplicity of sources help fuel speculation on the nature of the attack and character of the woman.

[15] Both 8 and 12 develop a careful bipartite structure (Giarratano, 1930: 65; Carrubba, 1965: 594–598; cf. Richlin's, 1983: 105, citation of Cic. *de Or.* 2.236; Henderson, 1999: 7; Watson, 2003: 291), and therefore "stereotypical" should not impugn or

persuade a young beloved to give in to love before it is too late, or are used by a wounded lover to retaliate. Either way, old age and physical deformities are projected onto the woman rather than being descriptive of any present reality.[16] If the woman were to read between the lines of the abuse, she could detect signs of an injured lover:

> δακρύεις ἐλεεινὰ λαλεῖς, περίεργα θεωρεῖς
> ζηλοτυπεῖς, ἅπτῃ πολλάκι, πυκνὰ φιλεῖς·
> ταῦτα μέν ἐστιν ἐρῶντος. ὅταν δ' εἴπω "παράκειμαι"
> καὶ σὺ μένῃς, ἁπλῶς οὐδὲν ἐρῶντος ἔχεις. (Phld. *A.P.* 5.306)

> You blubber, rattle on about pity, you stare at me, are jealous, you run your hands all over me, kiss me non-stop, just like a lover so far. Yet whenever I say, "Take me now," you hold up, and you have no trace of a lover in you.

Horace's iambist, like Philodemus' distressed impotent lover, looks the woman over from top to bottom (vv.3–10); he sounds jealous of her lifestyle, while he criticizes her haughty pretenses (vv.13–14). In the end, he still demands her sexual favors to strengthen the vigor he lacks (vv.19–

---

diminish Horace's poetics, especially his original use of language (see especially, Mankin, 1995: 154–158). Horace in epode 8 increases the level of brutality through a no doubt intentional repetition to the point of redundancy (n.b. *putidam* ... *turpis* ... *crudae* ... *putres*; *vetus* ... *senectus*; *enervet* ... *num nervi*). Not to mention that he utilizes every traditional point of attack, excepting that the woman drinks too much (Chloris, *C.* III.15; Lyce, *C.* IV.13; compare Archil. 42 W: "Just like a Thracian or Phrygian man his beer through a pipe, she sucked it in, bending over, working hard."); so Porter, 1987: 257: "... its vulgarity is so overdone, its conclusion so clever in its very obscenity, that one can scarcely take it seriously."; in similar fashion, Carrubba, 592. The Stoic scrolls are commonly read as a sign of the woman's hypocrisy (cf. epigrams that label males, pretending to be morally stern but in fact enjoying their sexual capers, hypocritical Stoics: Lucil. *A.P.* 11.155; Ammian. *A.P.* 11.156, 157). Richlin (1983: 111) from the viewpoint of the male iambist interprets the scrolls as a metaphor for the male phallus, which fails to respond to the woman. I would compare the personification of the scrolls (*libelli* ... / *iacere pulvillos amant*?, 15b–16) to Lydia's door loving its threshold (... *amatque / ianua limen*, *C.* I.25.3–4a). The animation of inanimate objects depersonalizes the woman, who might be using the scrolls to do the job of a lover (Juv. 6.337–338). If taken seriously, however, from the woman's point of view, the scrolls signal that she is a literary *docta* (Armstrong, 1989: 62). The question for this iambic is whose perspective really matters. Henderson, 1987/1999: 100, notes: "... what *you* can't see is the look from where she sees you, ... and then, *she's* the one doing the looking."

[16] E.g., Asclep. 2 *HE*; Call. 63 Pf. [*supra*]; Rufin. *A.P.* 5.12, 92, 103; Marc Arg. 5.118; cf. Hor. *C.* I.11; 25; Anderson, 1999: 86–88. Archilochus' invective against the older Neobule (196a W) flatters the younger woman he is seducing, and at the same time reminds her that she too will someday be old. Anacr. 87 *PMG* would make a clever retort to a man verbally accosting a young woman as if she were old: "I am already wrinkled and old, past ripe, because of your lust."

20).[17] Horace can be proud (or distressed at our human propensity to feed on each other's flesh; in a way the civil war of epode 7 drags on) that his attack has been so persuasive that we debate intensely the iambist's characterization of the woman, as if it could be factual—an old married woman of high standing, ugly and libidinous—when it is just as likely to be complete albeit effective fiction, conjured by the poet according to the standards of the tradition.[18]

When the attack is judged for what it is, an invective against a Roman woman so vicious that it confuses an audience trying to define the temperament of this iambist (too soft or not—impotent or not), its pivotal location in the middle of the collection between two civil war poems adds up.[19] Horace brings invective to its climax. On the one hand, this attack puts on full display a singular perspective of iambic, only "the words hunting down Lykambes." At the very moment in the collection when rage appears to have consumed Roman society in its cycle of vengeance (epode 7), Horace delivers an invective that seems to move iambic into a more limited arena, away from society in general and toward the individual.[20] In other words, this is the more restricted type of iambic that the slavish copy-cats of epistle 19 would expect Horace to have written.

17 On the textual history of the puzzling v.4 (Phld. *A.P.* 5.306), see Sider (1997: 149). Philodemus' epigrams deserve special mention in regard to epodes 8 and 12. His praise for a beautiful older woman (*A.P.* 5.13) is the mirror opposite of Horace's attack. Philodemus' *segnis amator* (*A.P.* 11.30) laments that when he was young he was good for five to nine times a night, but now only once (cf. epode 12:15–16a: *Inachiam ter nocte potes, mihi semper ad unum / mollis opus.*). The opening question of epode 8 presumes the woman spoke first, and the woman answers back in the companion epode 12. Impotence is a common theme in lyric and epigram (*supra*), but only Philodemus gives any significant space to writing *in feminae persona* (also Phld. *A.P.* 5.8 [36 Sider = Mel. 69 *HE*], 5.46, 5.120; cf. Anacr. 87 *PMG*; Asclep. 19 *HE*]).

18 Armstrong (1989: 63): "... even as a pure creation of poetry she sounds as if she might have been no older than forty;" Oliensis (1998) 75: "... the hideousness of the woman is manufactured to excuse the incapacity of the man." The hypothetical nature of invective has much to do with its pleasure for the audience (Richlin, 1983:105–106). Cicero argues that the case against Caelius is nothing more than "smart-alecky" invective (*maledictio ... petulantius iactatur*), which therefore cannot be proven and should not believed (*Cael.* 6.8–7.1). This does not stop him from treating Clodia like a caricature of a comic *meretrix*. Women are the proper, common targets of abuse. In the gender wars, Cicero can count on an invective against a woman being more acceptable and convincing for his male jury.

19 Watson (2003: 289) with some justification complains that an obsession with the archaic iambic tradition has removed any sense of "Roman immediacy" from the epode.

20 I am not pushing for a definitive answer on whether Horace addresses a real or imaginary woman, only that he gives us an intensely intimate invective. An invective need not be biographical to convey hard realities.

On the other hand, the poet forces retaliatory invective into the mouths of his audience, so that they must make judgments about iambic and expose in the process just how learned or unlearned they are. They are collaborators in the process. Horace's invective, therefore, reveals that vendetta is hard to control and that this type of iambic has public, at-large repercussions. When Horace masks the precise character of the woman, he hides whether the iambist stains the woman (individual) and/or whether the audience (society) allows the iambist to stain her for them and their amusement, and so they enjoy involving themselves in the messy business of casting blame. Vendetta does not stay a private matter.[21]

The scurrilous epode 8 stands at the near center of the collection, unnerving because it represents the point of irony that creates so much friction within Horatian iambic. Horace's protests against the charges that he is weak and impotent constitute acts of assertion and definition, which expose the Archilochean-Lykambid mentality to be too one-sided and destructive, and appealing. Epode 8 confuses. At epode 8 we do not know whether to enjoy sniggering at the "impotent" poet and the "ugly obtuse" woman, or not. Horace, by positioning the audience in this state of ambivalent hesitation, creates for them an emotive tension that includes simultaneously both aggression and repression. Thus, this invective marks Horace's attempt at formulating responsions to upstage the cycle of retaliatory vengeance, which had become the signature trademark of the iambic genre and which was killing his own people.

After epode 8 Horace begins rapid and often abrupt transitions in and out of invective (*non res et agentia verba Lycamben*) in between

---

[21] In Philip Roth's *The Human Stain* no character, especially Coleman Silk, is who they seem to be, but still they become in some way what others think them to be. When Roth places his fiction within the "historical" backdrop of the summer of 1998, he suggests that fiction has a way of morphing into "history" and then doing damage (2–3). 1998 was the summer of Monica Lewinsky's blue dress and the human stain, "... when terrorism ... was succeeded by cocksucking, and a virile, youthful middle-aged president and a brash, smitten twenty-one-year-old employee carrying on in the Oval Office like two teenage kids in a parking lot revived America's oldest communal passion, historically perhaps its most treacherous and subversive pleasure: the ecstasy of sanctimony ... It was the summer in America when the nausea returned, when the joking didn't stop, when the speculation and the theorizing and the hyperbole didn't stop ... when a president's penis was on everyone's mind, and life, in all its shameless impurity, once again confounded America." *Monica* and the woman of epode 8, creations evolved from a volatile public mixture of tradition, sexual infatuation, and pure invention, would have a lot to talk about. Horace's transition from civil war to cocksucking hardly stops human on human carnage.

and within individual epodes. Consequently, his *carmen* transgresses assumed literary and social limits, as the iambist, rotating through themes characteristic of other genres, labors to escape the notion that effective iambic must shame and destroy. I do not care to slow down and smooth out what Horace does not. His iambic criticism, in the uneven manner in which it is composed, causes its audience to experience the emotional and intellectual energy expended by a fractured people working to recover a sense of unity, when one perspective is not easily allowed to dominate the others. With this unevenness Horace configures his iambic as acts of responsion, which is how he begins to move iambic beyond the rage (epodes 9–17). How he resolves the process (fusion) into an invitation to join him in song (epode 17; *C.* I.16) will form the connection between his satiric/iambic and lyric career.[22]

Sympotic Anxiety (Epode 9)

Epode 9 returns to civil war but with a different strain: this time Horace holds out the promise of a sympotic celebration for Octavian's victory at Actium:

> Quando repostum Caecubum ad festas dapes
> victore laetus Caesare
> tecum sub alta (si Iovi gratum) domo,
> beate Maecenas, bibam[23]
> sonante mixtum tibiis carmen lyra,
> hac Dorium, illis barbarum,
>
> capaciores affer huc, puer, scyphos
> et Chia vina aut Lesbia
> vel, quod fluentem nauseam coerceat,
> metire nobis Caecubum:
> curam metumque Caesaris rerum iuvat
> dulci Lyaeo solvere. (1–6; 33–38)

[22] For definitions and descriptions of "transgression, responsion, fusion" and their ritual affinity, see the Introduction. It could be argued that Harrison's *Generic Enrichment* (2007b) is one of the elements that helps iambic advance beyond pure Archilochean rage in the *Epodes* (*supra*, Introduction).

[23] I find it impossible to render verses 1–4 with any elegance and preserve the hyperbaton. My apologies to Horace. S.B. prints "si" for *sic* (v.3). "Si" … *gratum* would be conventional (Shackleton Bailey, 1982: 80), but the condition, even if formulaic, introduces a greater tone of uncertainty into the opening question. The choice "si" or *sic* depends on how seriously an editor reads Horace's nausea at the end of the epode.

> The Caecuban in reserve for festal feasts, when, blessed Maecenas, will I, rejoicing for Caesar's victory, drink it in a high palace with you, if it be Jove's pleasure to grant, as the lyre sounds the song mixed in with the flutes, a Dorian and Phrygian medley.
>
> Boy, fetch bigger cups and Chian or Lesbian wine, or pass round the Caecuban to stem our swelling vomit. We are glad to throw over for sweet Lyaeus our concern and fear for Caesar's welfare.

This is the first example in the Horatian corpus of a political theme in a sympotic context—a primary construct in his lyric—and it is the first time ever that he envisions the lyre picking up the song.[24] The lyre naturally never plays in the dactylic hexameters of the *Satires*, but now after the invective of epode 8 it appears that the lyre with its sympotic song starts the book again at Actium with the potential to calm the menace by erasing the divisive social dynamics of *amicitia* expressed in epode 1.[25] The sympotic celebration Horace now proposes changes the high war towers (*inter alta navium, / … propugnacula*, epode 1.1b–2) for the security and prosperity of Maecenas' lofty palace (*sub alta … domo*, 9.3). The invitation is centered on camaraderie not class distinctions. A sense of shared space and physical togetherness (*tecum* at the heart

[24] If we take the lyric Horace at his word (*C.* I.6.17–20), he is above all a poet for the symposion (*C.* I.1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 17, 18, 20, 27, 36, 37, 38; II.3, 5, 7, 11, 14; III.1, 6, 8, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 28, 29; IV.1, 5, 11, 12, 13, 15); see Johnson, 2004b: 3–39.

[25] Horace's exuberant *io Triumphe … io Triumphe* (epode 9.21–23) comes without the added complication of being spoken by another character, such as the poor Pindaric imitator Iullus Antonius (*C.* IV.2.49–52; see Johnson, 2004b: 48–51). On the textual and historical challenges that surround epode 9, and how it fits the pattern of Horace's other sympotic lyrics, see Bartels, 1973: 282–313, and Johnson, 1997: 327–331 (cf. Loupiac, 1997: 129–140; 1998: 250–259; Watson, 2003: 316–317). Since 1997, I have grown more impatient with the questions that I and others asked about epode 9. How muddled is Horace's account of the battle (vv.7–20; Housman, 1882: 193–196; Wilkinson, 1945: 68, 109)? Were Horace and/or Maecenas present at Actium (Bücheler, 1878, 1879: 13 [*Kleine Schriften* 2, 320–333]; Heinze, 1958: 521–522; Wistrand, 1958; Watson, 2003: 310–311) or not (Fraenkel, 1957: 71–72; Johnson, 1997: 329 n.22), and if they were, was the nausea (v.35) brought on by seasickness or intoxication? Such questions dominate our conversations because we are unsure about Horace's circumstances, destined to stay vague since the sources offer inconclusive evidence. The only non-circumstantial evidence is *Eleg. in Maecenatem* 1.45–46 (1 cent. AD.; Schoonhoven, 1980), and it only mentions Maecenas not Horace. Horace's earlier readers, more up-to-date on who did what where, probably had no need to bother with such questions. Other questions, however, occur when the epode is read within the context of the collection. If epode 9 is a hoped-for lyrical celebration for Octavian's greatest victory to date, what is it doing in a collection published well after Actium, out of chronological order (there is more civil war to come, epode 16), and followed by such a "gloomy" ending (epodes 16–17)? Iambic is interacting with and having an effect on the sympotic moment.

of the invitation, 9.3) replace the dangers of war, which might forever separate two friends (*quid nos, quibus te vita si superstite / iucunda, si contra, gravis?*, 1.5–6). All is done for the pleasure of Jove (*si Iovi gratum*, 9.3) not the patron (*in tuae spem gratiae*, 1.24b), and so there is not a hint of any negative consequences caused by attendant social obligations.[26] Still, in spite of this con/geniality, there is something disjointed about the epode's dramatic sequencing. The opening invitation sets the party in the elegance of Maecenas' palace, and then the epode culminates, after only twenty-six verses, at a party where the nauseated celebrants are barely choking down the wine. The splendor of the future (1–6) versus the earthiness of the present party (33–38) tells against the symposia being the same occasion or even the same type (the future more agreeable; the present more menacing).[27]

If epode 9 responds to the hard war-time realities of epode 1, then the fears expressed pre-Actium (epode 1) have yet to subside in the victory-announcement. The resulting iambic/lyric strains reverberate together and cannot be separated. This iambic sympotic celebration, then, differs from any other lyric sympotic celebration that Horace will write. In Horatian lyric, symposia always represent life's present pleasures. The pains and fears in living and dying may be motives for sympotic respite, but the drinking itself provides pure enjoyment. Horace's lyrics never detail any physical discomforts that accompany intoxication. Immoderate drunkenness can cause violence and loose lips, but Horace marks these excesses as inappropriate sympotic behavior. The drinking party going on at the end of epode 9 is another story. It includes vomiting, not a pleasant experience, and although Horace orders a servant to bring Caecuban, the correct wine to quiet the nausea (35–36), a reader, under the influence of the hopeful sympotic invitation that begins the epode, which calls specifically for a Caecuban vintage, would not be predisposed to imagine that Horace anticipates the servant will return with Caecuban any time soon. At the least, the nauseated Horace's request for Caecuban carries the reminder that more of this wine is to be enjoyed, but later. That fine

---

26 Horace's change-up from social distinctions/separation to solidarity magnifies the treachery in Sextus Pompeius' and Marc Antony's class warfare. Pompeius, in a horrendous violation of social order, tried using the chains from the slaves, to whom he was obligated, to enslave Rome (*minatus urbi vincla quae detraxerat / servis amicus perfidis?*, 9.9–10). Antony placed himself under the dominion of a woman and became enslaved to her eunuchs (*Romanus . . . / emancipatus feminae / . . . et spadonibus / servire rugosis potest*, 9.11–14).

27 Compare Johnson (1997: 331) and Williams (1968: 217–220).

wine waits in storage for a grander celebration, which, absent the nausea, is on hold. The major festivity is postponed, for all we know indefinitely: the hyperbaton, *Quando ... bibam* (1–4), accentuates "symposion delayed." The lyric Horace never offers that a party be delayed, only that the persons invited will miss the party, if they decline the invitation or arrive too late, and he cautions those invited not to become preoccupied with a past they cannot change or with hopes for a future outside of their control. Therefore, while the sympotic epode 9 prefigures its lyric sequels in *Odes* I–III and their escape/relief from political pressures and anxieties via the sympotic present, it does not overrule the pressures evident in its iambic context. Rage is all around, and Horace only predicts his joy at Caesar's victory within the imagined future. Yet, this shift in time from the sympotic present to the future is what sets epode 9 apart from Horace's other drinking-parties, so that the lyre, surrounded by warfare, at least announces the potential for a new start.[28]

Cursing Maevius (Epode 10)

The Lykambid iambic eruption (epode 8) and disruption (epode 9) continue on in epode 10. Out of the anxious sympotic conclusion of epode 9, the book reverts to an invective in the Archilochean / Hipponactean mode (see Hippon. 115 W), a curse against a Maevius.[29] Horace's rapid point and counter-point could be read negatively, as it often is, as a mechanical ploy by a frustrated artist—he is losing patience with the persistence of the Lykambid tradition. From a positive perspective, however, Horace, the consummate iambic musician, is plying the varied poetic strings until they begin to resound together. As the strains are heard

---

[28] Cf. *nec mori per vim metuam tenente / Caesare terras*, *C.* III.14.15–16; *custode rerum Caesare **non furor***, *C.* IV.15.17.

[29] I am not optimistic about identifying the author of the first *Strasbourg Epode* (Archilochus or Hipponax; cf. Reitzenstein, 1899: 857–864; Kirkwood, 1961: 267–282; West, 1971: ad loc.; Degani, 1983: fr. 194; Watson, 1991: 59–62), and the fragment does not give sufficient details to confirm Cairns' hypothesis (1972: 56–60) that the *Strasbourg Epode* also is an inverted *propemptikon*. Horace, unlike either archaic predecessor, is more concerned with form than supplying any clear motivation for the invective except that Maevius smells. Who exactly Maevius may be stays an open question in spite of the scholiasts and early commentators who identify him with a poet Maevius, perhaps the brother of Bavius: *Qui Bavium non odit, amet tua carmina, Maevi, / atque idem iungat vulpes et mulgeat hircos* (Verg. *Ecl.* 3.90; cf. Porph.: ad loc.; Serv.; ad *Ecl.* 3.90; Philargyrius: ad *Ecl.* 3.90; Mariotti, 1963: 601–607).

and the individual sounds push their way into the other, we begin to discover to our own pleasure the compatibility in difference. "Strains" (multiple poetic types, their themes, and mood shifts, held in tension) become *sumplokē* (a type of interdependence). In this case, the threat against Maevius gains in potency, if it, like Horace's iambic, is read too narrowly. One cannot afford to be a pedantic critic.

Horace constructs the curse that Maevius suffer ship-wreck as a highly-stylized *anti-propemptikon*, which wishes him off but on a ship of evil omen (1–2). The iambist invokes in successive couplets (3–8) the Auster, Eurus, and Aquilo, the three winds that endanger passage on the Adriatic, to destroy Maevius' ship on the open sea. He prays that the stars go black (9–10). His prayer turns epic: may Maevius suffer the same divine wrath that destroyed Troy and afterwards Ajax's ship on his return home (11–14). He, then, imagines the success of his own invective, which places him in the same position as the audience listening to the character assassination of the "old woman" in epode 8. The invective is accepted reality, *fait accompli*. In the iambist's mind's eye, the sailors break out in sweat as Maevius wails like a woman and prays to a deaf Jove (15–20). Sacrifices to placate the gods end the epode, but only as a thank-offering for a Maevius dead on the shore—pickings for gulls (21–24). All is perfectly *sinister*, and balanced against a standard *propemptikon*.[30]

Nevertheless, if Maevius were a learned reader, he might not be so bothered by the straightforward inversion of a common motif, but rather that the sickly pale complexion the iambist puts on his face (*tibique pallor luteus*, 16), the un-manly shrieks (*et illa* ***non virilis*** *eiulatio*, 17), and the bellowing Ionian breaking apart his ship (*Ionius udo cum* ***remugiens*** *sinus / Noto carinam ruperit!*, 19–20) project him as a type of stranded

[30] *Propemptika* vary widely in form (Winniczuk, 1958: 406–419; Cairns, 1972: 1–16; see Jäger's listing, 1913: 69–70, universally cited). Horace's most famous example, composed for Vergil (*C.* I.3.1–8; N.-H., 1970: 40–43), illustrates standard components: prayer for divine protection, for bright stars, fair winds, and a safe arrival at the intended shores. Horace's strategy for inversion retains the motif's formulaic qualities (cf. Prop. 2.26; Fraenkel, 1957: 35; Watson, 2003: 340–341), which he manages with a hint of wry amusement, when in the center of the epode he flatly removes the *pro-* from *pemptikon* by splitting the regular positive *quietiore* … *aequore* with the negative *nec feratur* (v.11). The epode shares characteristics with Hellenistic curses, Ἀραί, (K.-H., 1884/1958: ad 10.12; Fedeli, 1978: 98; also Watson's, 1991: 254, account of shipwreck in curses), but the absence of learned allusions, a key component in the genre, advises some caution about a direct connection (Fraenkel, 1957: 34–35; Watson, 1991: 157–158).

and castrated Attis via Catullus 63.[31] Catullus leaves Attis alive. It is part of the horror he must face: to live on, however long, reliving what he has done to himself. The iambist finishes off the Attis legend for his enemy Maevius. After Maevius is castrated, he will die. This allusive threat supports the premise that Maevius was a bothersome poetaster, who may have committed sexual crimes.[32] It certainly pokes fun at his abilities as a literary critic. For Maevius, it is in fact dangerous to award Horace's iambic too meager a crown (*ac ne me foliis ideo brevioribus ornes*, *Ars* 26), because what results from Horace's routine performance of the inversion is an underhanded attack. There would be the temptation for a pedantic critic like Maevius to be caught up in the transparent and extended play with the *propemptikon* and overlook the more poignant reference to the castration of Attis. The ploy is indicative of Catullan iambic, which uses sexual scurrility to malign literary obtuseness.

Elegy, Iambic-Style (Epodes 11 and 15)

Then, before another invective is launched (epode 12), Horace in yet another counter interposes an elegiac-style plaint, a sharp contrast to the curse against Maevius (epode 10). Epode 11, therefore, again offsets for the moment Lykambid iambic by featuring a forlorn poet, who cannot continue on with his "little verses" (*versiculos*):

> Petti, nihil me, sicut antea, iuvat
> scribere versiculos amore percussum gravi,
> amore, qui me praeter omnis expetit
> mollibus in pueris aut in puellis urere. (11.1–4)

> Pettius, I do not at all enjoy, as before, writing verselets. I am smitten with a deep love, a love which longs for me to burn, like no other, for soft lads or lasses.

---

[31] Cat. 63.6–29: *itaque ut relicta sensit sibi membra sine viro, / … niveis citata cepit manibus leve tympanum, / … simul haec comitibus Attis cecinit notha mulier, / thiasus repente linguis trepidantibus ululat, / leve tympanum remugit, cava cymbala recrepant. Remugire* occurs a slim twelve times in the classical authors: first in Catullus (63.29) and once in Vergil (*G.* 3.45). Horace uses the verb twice (also *C.* III.10.6). If Catullus did not coin *remugire*, his use of the word to describe the sound of the tambourine, struck by the castrated Attis as he leads the worship of Cybele, influences later usage so strongly that the word consistently occurs in frenzied mystic or ominously threatening contexts (Verg. *A.* 6.99; 9.504; 12.722; 12.928; Ov. *Met.* 1.657; Sen. *Thy.* 676; Stat. *Theb.* 12.274; 12.602).

[32] Cf. *cum Bavio … frater*, Domitius Marsus, fr. 1; compare Schmidt, 1977: 406–412; Harrison, 1989: 271–273; Watson, 2003: 355–357. I agree the argument of the epode works especially well, if Maevius has a reputation for being a pedantic critic.

Horace with this transition (epodes 10–11) creates a sense of disjunction similar to the one bothering Aurelius and Furius, when they read Catullus' "Kiss Poem" (c.5):

> pedicabo ego vos et irrumabo,
> Aureli pathice et cinaede Furi,
> qui me ex versiculis meis putastis,
> quod sunt molliculi, parum pudicum. (Cat. 16.1–4)

> I will stick it in your ass and shove it down your mouth, Aurelius you pathic, you catamite Furius, for thinking that I, on the basis of my verselets, because they are soft, am not virtuous.[33]

As far as Furius and Aurelius are concerned, hendecasyllabes, a medium suited for retaliatory attacks, as Catullus knows (e.g., Cat. 12; 42),[34] do not suit the softer sentiments of the lover and his countless kisses. Catullus responds by retaining the structure of his first verse to Lesbia (*vivamus, mea Lesbia, atque amemus*, 5.1) but changing its content into some hard invective, and shoving it in his critics' mouth and anus (*pedicabo ego vos et irrumabo*). These two critics, just as the *imitatores* whom Horace attacks in epistle 19, made at least two mistakes: (1) interpreting Catullus' chosen poetic medium too narrowly,[35] and (2) assuming, therefore, that Catullus the person could not measure up to his literary task. Horace takes up this argument and suggests, by correlating invective and Roman love elegy, that his break with the destructive side of iambic (the Lykambid tradition) does not cause his verses to go completely "soft."[36] He is up to this task, bringing to Rome an iambic that cannot be limited to the words hunting down Lykambes.

Horace's iambist's plight (epode 11)—he is still composing in iambic—fits the standard elegiac script.[37] He complains he does not enjoy writing,

---

[33] It is hard to read into epode 11.1–4 that Horace actually composed *versiculi*. Horace uses the term (more than Catullus) for versification that is incompatible with the Roman satiric mentality. Such verses (*versiculi*) fail to remove love-pains (*S.* I.2.109–110); they are indicative of an overly affected Greek style (*S.* I.10.25–35). Lucilius could not have written them, because his topics were too harsh (*S.* I.10.56–61). The one other time Catullus labels his poetry *versiculi* is when he shares his literary passion with Calvus (c.50.4).

[34] See *supra*, Chapter 1, on Catullus' hendecasyllables and their capacity for invective.

[35] Pliny had a more comprehensive view, when he wrote his hendecasyllables: *atque ipsa varietate temptamus efficere, ut alia aliis quaedam fortasse omnibus placeant* (*Ep.* 4.14.3).

[36] Barchiesi (2001: 158) concludes that Horace's imitations of the "soft Callimachus" (e.g., epode 11.11–12 summarizing *I.* 3) comprise a revisionist construct used by Horace to distance his iambic from "the mellow."

[37] Most agree that epode 11 incorporates motifs of Roman love elegy (e.g., Luck,

while continuing to do just that (1–2). He is in love with being in love no matter with whom, and he is obsessed with writing about it no matter how love-sick he is (3–4). Even though he remembers how painful his love affair with Inachia was, when the city made him the big story, and his listlessness, silence, and deep sighs ruined banquets (5–10; cf. Sappho 31 L.-P.; Cat. 51.5–12), he does not resist becoming entangled in the whole mess again. His friends advised him to go home;[38] he went to his beloved's door and took up the post of the locked-out-lover (20–22). Friends' counsel and cajoling will do him no good. He believes that the one way out of his present love for Lyciscus is to be captivated by another, softer lover (23–28).[39] Love in this form proves itself as relentless and endless a cycle as retaliatory vengeance.

Epode 11, therefore, is not elegiac only. The poet totters off drunk, carried to his beloved's locked door by a force beyond his control, somewhere between the boundaries of the elegiac and iambic (*iussus abire domum ferebar incerto pede*, 20), playing the part of a weak-willed lover but speaking in iambic verse.[40] Even in the middle of the inescapable

---

1976: 122–126; Ezquerra, 1997: 7–26), including the complaint that being love-sick hinders poetic inspiration (McKeown, 1987.2: 9–10)—not surprisingly, if an author as far removed from love elegy as Lucretius has the maladies of *servitium amoris* well outlined (*DRN*. 4.1121–1191). On the development of Roman elegy and its common motifs, see Copley (1956), Luck (1959: 25–69), Miller (2004: 1–59), and Cairns (2006).

[38] Horace advises old Choris to do the same (*C*. III.15.13–16). She probably does not listen either.

[39] Compare the end of Corydon's lament for Alexis where he says to himself: *invenies alium, si te hic fastidit, Alexin*, *Ecl*. 2.73.

[40] I am unsure to what degree Horace's language (*incerto pede*, v.20) plays a standard joke on the metrics of the song. An "unsteady" or "limping" gait teases in general about verses composed with sudden shifts or missing feet, such as designating Hipponax's choliamb, the scazon or "limping" iambic (Phil. *A.P.* 7.405: ὅς οὐδ᾽ ἐν ᾅδῃ νῦν κεκοίμικεν χόλον, / σκάζουσι μέτροις ὀρθὰ τοξεύσας ἔπη.; Ov. *Rem. Am.* 377–378; cf. Catullus' reaction to the bad collection of poems that Calvus passed on for him to read: *vos hinc interea valete abite / illuc, unde malum pedem attulistis, / saecli incommoda, pessimi poetae.*, 14.21–23). Ovid gives the most memorable rendition at the beginning of the *Amores*, 1.1.1–4, 30, when Cupid comes along and turns verses elegiac by stealing a foot from the heroic hexameter (cf. McKeown, 1987.2: 13–14, on *Am*. 1.1.3–4: "I can cite no precedent for this conceit."). Horace's *incertus pes* would remind his audience about the principal characteristic of epodic and elegiac meters, the pairing of a longer and shorter verse. I am sure that Horace, while following the Archilochean Asynartete^{3} (the *First Cologne Epode*), would be aware that the first half of its shorter line is hardly distinguishable from the beginning of the elegiac pentameter, and that this could invite his audience to feel more acutely the tension between the iambic meter and elegiac themes (Hor. *Ars* 73–87; see Ovid's contention that theme should match meter: *materia conveniente modis*, *Am*. 1.1.1–2). See most recently Watson (2003: 362), who takes his cue from Kroll's descriptions of

cycle of love, iambic rage is present, if only in theory. The forlorn lover laments that he knew a way out of love's firm grasp. If he had given way to unrestrained anger (*'quod si meis inaestuet praecordiis / libera bilis'*, 15–16a), it would have thrown his plaints to the winds like the useless band-aids that they were (*'ut haec ingrata ventis dividat / fomenta, vulnus nil malum levantia'*, 16b–17). His sense of shame, banished, would have quit competing with "second-fiddle" rivals (*'desinet imparibus certare summotus pudor.'*, 18).[41] The lover's regret that he did not give his anger free rein idealizes unmitigated invective (***libera** bilis*, 16) and seduces those listening to accept "free rage" as a necessary good.[42] Like Aurelius and Furius, who think the iambic Catullus does not have the virtue required (*parum pudicum*) to write the "Kiss Poem," the lover of epode 11 also posits an essential incongruity between "soft" themes and "hard" verse. Horace, on the other hand, in epode 11 writes the "hard" and "soft" together: a cycle of love as inescapable as retaliatory invective together with unrestrained anger as the prescribed anecdote for unrequited love. Moreover, this iamb-elegy presents invective as more beneficial and less hypocritical than when the iambist/the freedman Horace warns the rich ex-slave how very freely those passing by on the street despise him (*videsne … ut ora vertat huc et huc euntium / **liberrima** indignatio*, epode 4.7–10). The result is a sophisticated irony that recognizes difference by the act of disregarding it, since Horace fuses two competing realities into a single song (*simplex*).

---

mixed-genres (1924: 202–224) and concludes: "… *Epode* 11 is a nice example of one of the types of genre-mixing … whereby subject-matter is consciously put into a metrical form which is contextually alien to it."

[41] This is the only time *inaestuo* (15) appears in Classical Latin (Prud. *c. Symm.* 1. praef. 58). Horace likely invented the word, which invokes the atmosphere from the curse that Maevius drown at sea (epode 10). Shackleton Bailey's text, combining emendations proposed by Campbell, 1945: ad loc. (adhuc: ut haec *codd.*), and Schütz, 1874: ad v.16 *bilis* (dividam: dividat *codd.*), follows the convention of the lover being the one who throws useless items to the winds (adhuc *ingrata ventis* dividam, v.16). Schütz lacks Shackleton Bailey's conviction and does not print his own suggestion: "Man hat vielleicht gegen die Hdschr. *dividam* zu lesen." Caution in this case is good editorial instinct. Horace's lover ponders remedies, cause and effect (bile, removing shame, bringing freedom). Therefore, *bilis* as the subject of both *inaestuet* and *ut … dividat*, and *pudor* as the subject of *desinet* render perfect and consistent sense. The condition does not become more definite until the conclusion, *desinet*. This does not solve the question for Mankin (1995: 202), that if *pudor* means "genuine shame," a positive good, it should be encouraged not eliminated. He flirts with accepting S. B's "commotus" for *summotus*.

[42] Cf. Catullus' choliambic 8, where he tries to jolt himself out of his weak love-sick state (*miser*, v.1) by berating himself (*desinas ineptire*, v.1), ordering himself to harden up (*obdura*; *obdurat*, vv.11–12), and then attacking the woman (*at tu dolebis*, v.14).

The responsion between the "soft" and "hard" is developed further in epode 15, which likewise imports rage into matters of love. The iambist again draws the song according to an elegiac script: a night lit by a bright moon (1–2),[43] his beloved Neaera swearing to be a faithful lover, and, then, a lament that she betrayed his love (3–4). After these opening couplets, Horace turns this standard love-plot into curse-filled mockery, now expressing the anger he only imagined would cure a broken heart in epode 11.15–18.

The oath Horace made Neaera repeat, as though he were the commanding general in their love affair (*in verba iurabas mea*, 4), is specifically designed to recall the soft themes he has tried out in iambic form since epode 9; but Neaera was not the type to be impressed by a mild-mannered iambist. Her promise to be a loyal lover in its argument constitutes a symbolic paradigm for a one-sided approach to iambic: the words hunting down Lykambes. She would love her man as long as the wolf stays hostile to the lamb, Orion troubles sailors, and the breeze riles Apollo's locks (7–10). The words the oath-swearing puts on her lips presupposed a world order (animal, human, divine) grounded in distinct and permanent division, which would leave her unsatisfied with her lover's iambic performance. It is as if she, a *docta puella*, has listened well since epode 9 and noticed that the iambist has been chased off like a lamb (epode 12.25–26). His curse, which roused the rough seas to shipwreck Maevius, has given way to sympotic repose on a rainy day (epodes 10 and 13). Apollo's hair whipping in the wind has become the fashionable hairdressings of the young lovers (epode 11.27–28). The oath she swore, by contrast, bargained for a strong iambic lover. The language Horace uses to introduce Neaera (*artius atque hedera procera astringitur ilex / lentis adhaerens bracchiis*, 15.5–6) presents her—not him—as the proper complement to the young stud Amyntas of Cos, who had no problem staying hard for lovers (*cum mihi Cous adesset Amyntas, / cuius in indomito constantior inguine nervus / quam nova collibus arbor inhaeret.*, 12.18–20). The comparison (Neaera: Amyntas) exposes a basic incompatibility between Neaera and her jilted lover, iambist: ivy (the female) is wont to wrap itself around a strong tree (the male). Neaera's lover is no Amyntas, and now that she has found him in direct violation of the oath she has rightly discarded him for a better rival.

[43] Compare the settings of Prop. 1.10.1–10; Ov. *Am.* 1.5.1–6.

Horace is locating within the character of Neaera and the oath the likely reaction of his audience to his literary point and counter-point with invective (love elegy / iambic rage). Just when Neaera thought that the iambist was going soft, as we all might well have since epode 9, he reappears full force right in the middle of his love lament and personalizes invective by punning on his most non-iambic sounding name, *Flaccus*—"Floppy." This is the only time in the *Epodes* that Horace names himself, and when he does he lays further claim to his own brand of potency.[44] He will not allow Neaera's broken vow, nor its presuppositions about what constitutes iambic, to stand without answering back:

o dolitura mea multum virtute Neaera![45]
nam si quid in Flacco viri est,
non feret assiduas potiori te dare noctes
et quaeret iratus parem,
nec semel offensi cedet constantia formae,
si certus intrarit dolor. (15.11–16)

O Neaera, you can be sure that my manhood will cause you great pain! Since in "Floppy" there is some manliness, he will not endure you giving his rival countless nights, and angered he will find a good match; nor once he is wronged will his resolve surrender to your beauty, since pain has shot him straight through.

Horace responds by capping the elegiac-styled plot with a strong invective, laughing at the pain Neaera's new beloved will endure, when she this time betrays him—

formaque vincas Nirea,
heu heu, translatos alio maerebis amores:
ast ego vicissim risero.[46] (15.22–24)

[44] Wronged elegiac lovers threaten to leave, but never really do (e.g., Prop. 2.5.9–16; 2.25.15–20; 4.1.135–150; Tib. 2.6.11–28). Cairns (1972: 82) emphasizes the conditional nature of Flaccus' response, which is typically read as conveying a degree of doubt: "If only there is some bit of the man in Flaccus … if grief will have come for certain." Without the voice of the poet delivering the lines, it is hard to read the tone: wishful thinking, regret, sarcastic resentment, etc. The condition is definite and could come close to a declarative statement ("Since Floppy has some man in him yet … since pain has come for sure"). This assertive and angry tone fits better the following invective against the rival (vv.17–24); compare Mankin, 1995: 241.

[45] Horace reserves the combination of the vocative and future participle for strong rebuke (e.g., *moriture Delli*, *C.* II.3.4).

[46] Horace's *vicissim* punctuates the shift from suffering to derision (a standard transition: *C.* I.4.1; 25.9; III.28.9; Prop. 3.25.15).

> And even if you were to be prettier than Nireus, "ahh me, ahh me," you will mourn, when she gives her love away to someone else; but, I, in my turn, will laugh.

—but, whereas the oath Neaera swore utilized symbols of natural enmity and opposition, the iambist's vengeful retort depends on Neaera's steadfastness. She will not change her lying and cheating. When the iambist admits that his invective, based on his elegiac perspective, will not affect Neaera's character—once faithless always faithless—he achieves a total alignment (correspondence/fusion) between endless elegiac pain and the futility of iambic conceptualized as "rage-only," which returns the cycle to the end of epode 12 and the beginning of epode 14.

Mixing-Up Iambic Expectations (Epode 12)

Epode 12 pairs off with the sexual invective of epode 8. They are twins.[47] In both the iambist verbally assaults a woman ("old"), whom he has not been able to satisfy. These invectives, however, are not identical twins. This time both male and female share an equal voice in the iambic madness: an invective of thirteen verses each. Epode 12 is a reciprocal iamb imitating the amoebaean folk song where speakers trade off in a verbal game of one-on-one (*reddens mutua*, Cat. 50.6): the iambist accuses the woman of a rabid sexual appetite (12.1, 9, 11–12) / she says he has no reason to complain, if he pleasures Inachia three times a night (12.14–16); he says she smells like a sow and her body is all wrinkled up (12.4–8) / she protests that she could have enjoyed Amyntas, a strong bull of a lover (12.16–20); her cosmetic-covers drip from her sex-sweated face (12.9–12) / she sends him richly dyed purple cloth as a token of her love (12.21–24). When Horace equalizes the iambic exchange in this manner, can the participants in this drama find some common ground? Hardly. In this case, casting blame back and forth does not diffuse the escalation, nor does it produce a satisfactory climax for either participant, because each conceives of iambic from their own point of view only. He is as unlearned in iambic as he thinks she is. We could compare the calamity of Fescennine license, when the exchange of insults grew so violent and out of control, like a rabid dog, that laws were passed against

[47] All the possible precedents Horace may have followed (*supra*), as well as the secondary sources cited, for epode 8 apply to 12. No one mentions either poem without referencing the other.

them (*Epist.* II.1.145–155). Gradually the dog grew tame out of fear of punishment (*formidine fustis*, 154). Then, the people changed their tune (*vertere modum*, 154) and found their way back to songs ending in delight (*delectandumque reducti*, 155). The male and female iambists of epode 12 are not so much "tamed" as frustrated by the narrow Lykambid mentality, since it does not fulfill their iambic expectations.

The plot, constructed by innuendo from the young man's invective, seems to be that he has just completed an appointment with an older client, who proved very difficult to satisfy sexually. She went at him before he could even "put up" and broke the bed in her orgasmic heat. Now she is trying to set up another go before he has had a chance to cool off or firm up (*munera quid mihi quidve tabellas / mittis nec firmo iuveni neque naris obesae?*, 2–3).[48] In answer to the gifts that she has sent to entice him back, he launches the first verbal attack, which begins with a direct address (1–6) and ends in the third person, treating her as if she were an outside party listening in on his complaints (9–12). The whole affair sours his stomach (*vel mea cum saevis agitat fastidia verbis*, 13). Then, she has her turn and replies to his demeaning tirade with her own assault on his manhood: "Look, you should have been able to satisfy me like you do Inachia—the first time and more than once" (15–17). Her invective frightens him. By the end of her counter-attack, he runs away like a lamb flees a wolf or a roe-deer a lion, on the wrong end of the iambic food-chain (25–26)—the assailant becomes the Lykambid.

This iambic tête-à-tête accomplishes little whether the invective works or not. The opening reaction of the male iambist shows that he thinks he knows the iambic game very well: invective should punish and silence the one who offends. After all, both Lykambes and his daughters and the artists Bupalus and Athenis, when attacked by their iambists, committed suicide. Right from the start he is surprised that this woman keeps coming back no matter what: "What kind of power do you have, most fine mate for big black elephants?" (*Quid tibi vis, mulier nigris dignissima barris?*, 1).[49] He is so shocked in fact that he gives up talking directly to her after the first six lines and begins detailing her bedroom behavior

---

[48] *Nec firmo* parallels Maecenas' question at epode 1.15–16: *roges tuum labore quid iuvem meo / imbellis ac firmus parum*. Horace's response to his patron, more tactful, is just as firm and certain. His iambic will measure up to the demands of the occasion; see epode 1, Chapter 1.

[49] Catullus asks the same question, when he expresses similar mock surprise that Ravidus left himself open to attack by Catullus' iambs: *quid vis? qualubet esse notus optas? / eris, quandoquidem meos amores / cum longa voluisti amare poena.*, 40.6–8.

to some other party, or perhaps just muttering the rest of the complaint to himself (the third person *properat*, v.9). It becomes clear to him that his iambic will probably not drive his persistent assailant away. Now comes Horace's clever surprise. After the female iambist launches her cutting retaliatory assault, she also is left talking to herself, but wondering why her hard words repelled her lover ('*o ego non felix, quam tu fugis ut pavet acris / agna lupos capreaeque leones!*,' 25–26). She is caught completely off-guard, when her iambic works the way *he thinks it should* (Lykambid-style). The woman's surprise at the male's flight implies that she imagined a different *telos* from the iambic exchange, one that could realize mutuality as in iambic ritual.[50] Thus, Horace, the master iambic manipulator, plays a sophisticated game of irony with these two sub-iambists. He perfectly controls two opposing views of iambic to form one wonderfully balanced song of "he said / she-said" in which each participant ends up wishing that they had achieved the other's aim. The outcome, however, as far as the characters are concerned is total and futile frustration, no resolution at all: his invective did not succeed, when he expected it to and wanted it to; her invective did succeed, although not in the way she wanted or anticipated. In Horace's mix-up of iambic expectations, a monolithic approach to iambic proves the worse.

Late Delivery: Maecenas and His Love-Sick Poet (Epodes 13–14)

Horace introduces a different cast of characters for epode 14 (the over-sexed woman is gone, epode 12; enter a love-sick poet and his patron), but he begins epode 14 right where he left off in the invective/s of epode 12 and the sympotic epode 13:

Inachiam ter nocte potes, mihi semper ad unum
    mollis opus. pereat male quae te
Lesbia quaerenti taurum monstravit inertem, (12.15–17)

You satisfy Inachia three times in one night; for me you go soft at one try. Lesbia can go to hell! She recommended you do-nothing-dick, when I was looking for a bull.

                    … rapiamus, amici,
    occasionem de die, dumque virent genua
et decet, obducta solvatur fronte senectus.

[50] See Introduction and Chapter 1.

tu vina Torquato move consule pressa meo.
cetera mitte loqui; deus haec fortasse benigna
reducet in sedem vice. (13.3–8a)

Friends, we should grab hold of any opportunity the day brings and, while our knees are strong and we are able, not act like old men with long faces. You, bring out the wine, pressed when my Torquatus was consul. Do not talk about anything else. The god, likely as not, will in time favor us once more.

Mollis inertia cur tantam diffuderit imis
oblivionem sensibus,
pocula Lethaeos ut si ducentia somnos
arente fauce traxerim,
candide Maecenas, occidis saepe rogando.
deus, deus nam me vetat
inceptos olim, promissum carmen, iambos
ad umbilicum adducere. (14.1–8)

"Why has do-nothing-laziness rendered my senses completely comatose, as though I, to quench a burning thirst, had drained to the last drop cups inducing Lethean slumber?," splendid Maecenas, you are killing me with this repeated question. The god, the god orders me not to wrap up the iambics I began, the song I promised long ago.

The notice served that the poet is long overdue on the deadline to deliver his work combines the woman's invective (epode 12) and the pleasures of a drinking party (epode 13) into an elegiac-styled excuse that Love prevents him from completing the task. The first two words (*Mollis inertia*) hit on the focal point in the woman's charge against the iambist (*mollis* … *inertem*, 12.16–17), and the question ("Why?," *cur* …) goes on to picture Horace as a thirsty reveler, who has fully enjoyed his day and is passed out from a good drunk, so sound asleep and mindless it is as if he had drained draughts of Lethe-water. The implication is not just that he may be too weak to make good on iambic, but that he is, so to speak, sleeping off his sympotic celebration in epode 13.[51]

[51] Epode 13 contains the lyric Horace's standard sympotic ingredients; see Muir's (1981: 322) comparison to the Soracte Ode (I.9). I limit the comparisons to those particularly close in phrasing (see Johnson, 2004b: 3–26): changes in the weather and seasons symbolizing mortality (1–3; *C.* I.4.1–4; IV.7.1–12; 12.1–8); the isolation of the present as the only moment humans control (7–8; *C.* I.9.9–14), reinforced by the repetition of temporal adverbs (*nunc*: 2, 8; *C.* I.4; 7.31; 9.2, 18, 21; III.29.17–21); the *carpe diem* invitation (*rapiamus* … *occasionem*, 3–4; explicit in all Horatian symposia and implicit in *C.* II.16; n.b. the doomed Achilles, 16.29); a serio-comic tone achieved by supporting invitations to life's pleasures with reminders of the impermanence of life and the necessity of death

Horace allows the supposition that he is questioning himself for the first four verses (*cur … traxerim*); then, with the direct address (*candide Maecenas*) and the second-person (*occidis*), he transposes the question into a complaint repeated at him by his patron. Horace is acting as if it does not register even with Maecenas what the iambic Horace is all about. Maecenas plays the antagonist well. His question posits an anti-sympotic, anti-lyric perspective, since he presses his "drunk" poet to come to his senses and return to his iambic project. The patron does not see how to join the sympotic with the iambic. Horace gives a hard answer to Maecenas, tantamount to homicide/suicide, a response similar to Archilochus' Lykambids and Hipponax's Bupalus: "Maecenas, you are killing me with this endless line of questioning!" (*occidis saepe rogando*). The highly stylized solemnity of the direct address and the celestial *geminatio* (*candide Maecenas … deus*, *deus*) tell against Horace's claim that his love for Phryne leaves him too weak to write (*me … Phryne macerat*, 15–16). He has his iambic wits, however much he may pretend otherwise.[52]

This all, of course, is a howler of a joke, not too politic, on the notion that Horace should keep his iambic on the narrow path of personal invective intent on harming. The opening question assigns to Maecenas the reaction of an audience growing impatient with Horace's introduction and reintroduction of supposedly more placid themes. Horace in epode 14 stubbornly insists that iambic by encompassing more than the "hard" does not go "soft." Again, Horace's iambic praxis is not a case of either-or, but both-and. He takes the iambic dimeter, the alternate line of epodes 1–10, and fronts it with the heroic hexameter (epode 14) right in view of

(12–16; *C.* I.4; 9; 11; II.3; 11; 14; cf. Commager, 1962: 173, 282; Babcock, 1978: 107–118; Lowrie, 1992: 414–415, 422–426); the equating of wine and song, shared human experiences, to relieve cares (9–11, 17–18; *C.* III.28; IV.11.31–36). Epode 13 is one of the few sympotic invitations where wine is powerful enough to reverse the effects of aging and suspend time (*dumque virent genua / et decet, obducta solvatur fronte senectus*, 4b–5; *C.* IV.12.19; Johnson, 2004b: 163). Its song uniquely stresses rejuvenation in the face of death; cf. Oliensis' comparison (1998: 97) to the fantastic utopia of epode 16.

[52] Watson (2003: 455–457) emphasizes the neotericism of epode 14 (the *recusatio*; learned allusions; the careful compressed style). Horace would likely distinguish himself, strictly speaking, from the neoterics (*Epist.* I.19.1–11), but he does display aspects of Callimacheanism beginning at epode 1, when he places Maecenas on swift boats surrounded by the towering ships. Horace's insistence that he would be able to follow Maecenas tips off that the "small voice" does not negate the serious and weighty (Johnson, 2004b: 3–39; "Whatever modesty he pretends, Horace never had a small voice," 3). Horace's Callimacheanism does not result in mild-mannered iambic, see epode 1, Chapter 1.

the Centaur's mythic epic/lyric at the end of epode 13 (vv.12–18), which advises the doomed Achilles to ease every trouble with wine and song:

> 'illic omne malum vino cantuque levato
> deformis aegrimoniae, dulcibus alloquiis.' (17–18)

> There lighten every evil with wine and song, sweet consolations of ugly distress.

Horatian drinking-parties and their *carpe diem* invitations gain their power to seduce through the inevitability of human suffering and mortality. These primary sympotic ingredients, wine and song, symbolize humanity's common bond, sweet enough to be a consolation:[53]

> o fortes peioraque passi
> mecum saepe viri, nunc vino pellite curas:
> cras ingens iterabimus aequor (*C.* I.7.30–32)

> O courageous heroes, who with me often suffered worse things, now with wine dispel cares; tomorrow we will sail the vast sea.

> … age iam, meorum
> finis amorum
>
> (non enim posthac alia calebo
> femina), condisce modos amanda
> voce quos reddas; minuentur atrae
> carmine curae. (*C.* IV.11.31b–36)

> Come now, last of my loves—for after this I will not burn for another woman—learn with me measures to sing back with your lovely voice; black cares will lose their power as we sing.

---

[53] *Deformis aegrimoniae, dulcibus alloquiis* (v.18) is still raising eyebrows (Mankin, 1995: 226–227 n.18; Lowrie, 1992: 431 n.48; Watson, 2003: 437 n.18). This is the first time the noun *alloquium* occurs and there is little to justify its use with an objective genitive. *Aegrimonia* is rare. *Alloquium*, meaning shared speech, is an uncommon usage (Luc. *B.C.* 10.173–174a: … *longis, Caesar producere noctem / inchoat adloquiis*), but along with wine and song it is an essential sympotic ingredient. In light of Horace's later sympotic poetry—any of his sympotic moments would be a good example (Johnson, 2004b: 3–26)—it seems best to take the verse as elaborating on the sense of the line before: shared experience, wine and song, is the antidote for human pain. The Homeric Achilles, fated to die, took Chiron's advice, but only after his friend Patroclus was killed (see Mankin, 1989: 139–140; Lowrie, 1992: 428, n.39). Plautus places *alloqui* as the last component in an erotic *quinque lineae* (*Nam qui amat quod amat si habet, id habet pro cibo*: / *videre, amplecti, osculari, alloqui, Merc.* 744–745). In the last position coitus is expected, but if Horace's *alloquium* gives any indication, then Pautus' *alloqui* may contain that notion euphemistically in the sense of "commune."

Horace is pressing alternate literary types and their multiple outlooks into his iambic over Maecenas' 'supposed' objections, and accordingly he bolsters his lyric/epic myth-making with two exempla for erotic passion: Anacreon's legendary (*dicunt*) love for Bathyllus, which inspired lyric song, and then Paris' passion for Helen, which destroyed Troy (epode 14.9–14). Divine Love, lyric-style, finds its way into Horace's iambics, and the poet reminds Maecenas that his patron's experience, like his, includes love and lament (*ureris ipse miser; quod si non pulchrior ignis / accendit obsessam Ilion*, 14.13–14). When Horace compares Maecenas' love to the passion between Helen and Paris, he compliments the overpowering beauty of Maecenas' beloved, but that love affair also brought peoples to war and burned Troy to the ground. Love can be perilous. Into all this talk of love and lament, the shared experience of the ill-starred love, Horace in the last couplet of epode 14 introduces societal distinctions. Maecenas will love one sort: a beloved no less beautiful and dangerous than the epic greats.[54] Horace will love quite another: the freedwoman Phryne, not the type or expected to be the type to love one man (*gaude sorte tua*; *me libertina neque uno / contenta Phryne macerat.*, 15–16). Horace's patron, love-struck as he is, remains in one class, separated off from Horace and his beloved Phryne.[55] Horace will finish this book without doubt but on his own more inclusive, yet still iambic, terms.

---

[54] Love on an epic/noble scale can be very dangerous (see Hor. *C.* II.4.1–12). There were rumors that Maecenas loved a pantomime Bathyllus (Tac. *Ann.* 1.54.2; Cass. Dio 54.17.5; Watson, 2003: 449), which, if the timing were right (Bathyllus along with Pylades made the pantomime popular in Rome around 23 BC; cf. Pers. 5.123; Juv. 6.63), would make the epode more than mythic and add a touch of playful incongruity to the punch-line about the noble character of Maecenas' love (Watson: "as one tradition informs us, Bathyllus was Maecenas' *libertus*," Σ Pers. 5.123; cf. Sen. *Contr.* 10 *praef.* 8).

[55] Watson (2003: 428) raises the question of why Horace dates the wine by his birth year (epode 13.6), and I add especially when he does not often date wines (see also *C.* I.9; 20; III.8; 14; 21; 28; IV.11; *Epist.* I.20.26–28). Horace will speak of his age elsewhere (e.g., *C.* II.4.21–24; III.14.28; *C.* IV.1.1–8; *Epist.* II.2.41–57) and mentions his birthday at *C.* IV.11, which celebrates Maecenas as his age-mate. *C.* IV.11 compliments Maecenas by including allusions to *C.* II.17, which combines *carpe diem* with expressions of friendship reserved for Horace's closest associates, Maecenas, Vergil, and other poets of the circle: *alter ego*; *animae dimidium meae* (*S.* I.5.41–42; *C.* I.12; IV.10; 11; Johnson, 2004b: 139–145). I suspect in epode 13 that the *amici* in Horace's mind are also his closest literary associates. The self-reference by the dating of the wine interjects Horace into the poem as one of the *amici* on a level of equality not elsewhere found in the *Epodes*. Thus, the epode projects the communal values that Horace will develop fully in the transition from the *Epodes* to the *Odes*, a tonal shift that, I believe, explains the epode's popularity (Wilamowitz, 1913: 306; Campbell, 1924: 143; Reitzenstein, 1925: 24; Wilkinson, 1945: 147; Fraenkel, 1957: 65: Kilpatrick, 1970; 135; Garrison, 1991:

When the Horatian iambist rotates through themes more common to other poetic modes ("generic enrichment"), it allows him to achieve a deep-seated irony in his iambic praxis and critique. Horace's criticism of a one-sided view of iambic as purely rage is depicted not through his impotence, that is, falling short of iambic by being soft. His iambic criticism rather centers itself in his resistance to being soft with the end result that the iambist and all those around him become involved in the rage (epodes 1–7). Consequently, while Horace asserts the destructive nature of the Lykambid mentality, he can incorporate into his iambic different voices (unsatisfied women; Chiron; Maecenas; Neaera) along with his own to express diverse registers (mockery: epodes 8, 10, 12; communal celebration / consolation, epodes 9, 13; love plaint: epodes 14, 15), so that iambic encompasses more than the enraged side of invective, "the words that hunt down Lykambes and his daughters."[56] A low-level critic like Maevius, the servile imitators, or in the *Ars Poetica* the bad painter and mad poet, would have trouble comprehending the whole. As Horace later says, he loves to be read by the eyes and hands of the well-born, who presumably would know how to "come to grip" with his verse (*Epist.* I.19.34).[57] For example, to appreciate the frictions in epodes 8 and 12, one must understand both the Lykambid and ritual views of iambic. The Lovers' plight and quarrels (epodes 14, 15) require sensing the competing outlooks of an elegiac and iambic lover. Human suffering (war and love) benefits from a sympotic consolation (epodes 9, 13). Such polyphony does more than attract and entertain, although it does both; it raises the desire and expectation that supposed opposites can converge and a new unity emerge from them. Generic variety and how it alters expressions of rage become essential features in Horace's iambic praxis, because thinking through ("listening to") how Horace forms differences into a whole teaches an attitude counter to a "versus-you" mindset,

---

189). Given how Horace from the start of the *Epodes* assimilates *amicus* into his iambic vocabulary and makes his iambic operate between levels of friendship (epode 1.2; 6.6; 9.10; 10.9; 11.21; compare epode 11.25; 16.50), *amici* should not be a particular person's name, "Amicius" (Housman, 1923: 104; S.B.; cf. Watson, 2003: 425–426).

[56] The danger in assuming a completely soft iambist is that it implies Horace dismisses any positive value for iambic invective. If so, it would be hard to explain why Horace would write iambic, or even satire for that matter. Horace's iambic praxis does not conveniently fit into such mutually exclusive categories as hard and soft. The "irony" in Horace's iambic criticism reaches a deeper level where anger plays a part within a larger process of transitioning from human pain and brokenness to a new sense of understanding and insight. Hiding in Horace's iambic is Demeter's smile (see Introduction and Chapter 1).

[57] I borrow the phrase from Mayer, 1994: 266 v.34.

which in turn defuses the motivation for anger and retaliation evident in warring. This moves Horace's iambic toward its impending resolution in song, which, far from fixating on anger and being reduced to insult and injury, models how to find through a diverse plurality harmony instead of division (a *telos* in line with ritual).[58] Now Horace within this fuller range of iambic is about to engage once more warring Rome (epode 16) and Canidia (epode 17), the two main antagonists in his iambic drama. He will turn the tables on Lykambid iambic and sing with Canidia its star.

[58] See the Introduction and Chapter 1.

CHAPTER FOUR

HORACE'S LYING LYRE (EPODES 16–17)

A gathering of angels appeared above my head,
They sang to me this song of hope and this is what they said,
They said, "Come sail away, come sail away, come sail away
with me, lads."

I thought that they were angels, but to my surprise,
We climbed aboard their starship, we headed for the skies,
Singing, "Come sail away, come sail away, come sail away
with me, lads."
(*Styx*, "Come Sail Away," 1977)

Sailing Away: Iambic Hopes (Epode 16)

The iambist prophesies (epode 16): "Our civil wars will destroy Rome. To sail away to the Blessed Isles is our only hope." When the iambist argues for loss (abandoning Rome) as the only means to gain (a pain free life), he strains the imagination and exposes himself to the full contempt of his fellow-citizens, who, if they act on historical precedent, will judge him a traitor.[1] Horace is not deterred. He runs the risk of a flight-filled fantasy that affords him the chance to rewrite Rome the way the iambist would like it to be. The iambist adopts a utopian perspective, which turns mythic, escapist, and is overwritten with the tone of invective. He balances the epode perfectly between destruction (1–14), curse (15–38), and promise (39–66), framing the whole by combining the plot-elements of epode 1 (journey) and epode 7 (the endless cycle of civil conflict). By the time epode 16 ends, the iambist will be Jupiter's prophet leading his

[1] Watson, 2003: 484, pinpoints the prime question for epode 16: "How can *virtus* (39) be expressed by flight from Rome, an action which was elsewhere seen as shameful?" He cites M. Furius Camillus' heroic stand against the proposal to abandon Rome to the Gauls and flee to Veii (Liv. 5.49–55) and Q. Fabius Maximus' scathing rebuke to any notion that the loss at Cannae meant Rome had to be abandoned to Hannibal (Liv. 22.53–55). Rumors that they were thinking of transferring the seat of power from Rome to Egypt worked against both Julius Caesar and later Marc Antony.

comrades in a flight from war-weary Rome (*fuga*, the last word, 66), and he will define real virtue as the courage to imagine a harmonious world. Horace's iambic will embrace pessimism and optimism, pain and relief (mirroring the rotation in epodes 8–15). In so doing, epode 16 envisions a progression from brokenness to healing similar to that in the *Hymn to Demeter* and looks back to other fantastic journeys as literary solutions to real political problems (for example, Aristophanes' *Frogs*).

Before the iambist invites his Romans to travel to a perfect world, he first, just as he did in epodes 1–7, brings them face-to-face with the curse of their own destruction, the hopelessness of ending their propensity for citizen-on-citizen violence (γνῶθι σαυτόν):

> Altera iam teritur bellis civilibus aetas
> suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit.
> quam neque finitimi valuerunt perdere Marsi
> minacis aut Etrusca Porsenae manus,
> aemula nec virtus Capuae nec Spartacus acer
> novisque rebus infidelis Allobrox,
> nec fera caerulea domuit Germania pube
> parentibusque abominatus Hannibal,
> impia perdemus devoti sanguinis aetas
> ferisque rursus occupabitur solum;
> barbarus, heu, cineres insistet victor et urbem
> eques sonante verberabit ungula
> quaeque carent ventis et solibus ossa Quirini,
> (nefas videre!) dissipabit insolens. (1–14)

> Another generation now is trampled by civil wars and by her own power *Power* (*Roma*) collapses. The neighboring Marsians did not have the strength to destroy her, nor did menacing Porsena's Etruscan might, nor Capua's rival valor, nor spirited Spartacus, nor Gaul treacherous in times of insurrection, nor did wild Germany, its youth blue-eyed, tame her, nor did Hannibal by parents detested.[2] An impious age, a cursed bloodline, we will destroy her, and her land the beasts will take back for their own. A conquering foreigner, it pains me to say, will stand on her ashes and the horseman, hooves thundering, will beat the city flat, and—an unspeakable sight—Quirinus' bones, kept safe before from the wind and rain, he in arrogance will scatter.

The epode begins with a most sinister couplet. The rhythmic assonance that frames the first verse (*altera iam … aetas*) assumes that an earlier generation has already been slaughtered and the death of the next is

---

[2] War robs parents of their children and wives their husbands, a theme Horace repeats (*C.* I.1.24–25; III.14.9–11; IV.2.21–22; 4.67–68; 5.9–14); cf. Watson, 2003: 494.

a foregone conclusion. This present generation is now in the process of being trampled (*teritur … urbem / eques sonante verberabit ungula*, 1, 11b–12). Similar language in *C.* IV.7.9–10a to describe the endless rotation of the seasons shows the cyclical nature of death upon death that the iambist has in mind: "spring tramples over summer destined to die" (*… ver proterit aestas / interitura*).[3] Rome's fall (*Roma … ruit*), the final action in the opening couplet, brings back the initial question of epode 7, when the iambist positions himself as an observer of a tragedy that he cannot prevent—*Quo, quo, scelesti ruitis?*, "To where, where, you miscreants, are you racing?"—and like in epode 7, the iambist in epode 16 retains the power to proclaim. For the next three couplets he announces, one after another in an unbroken run of negatives, those enemies of Rome who failed to destroy her (3–8). He then cuts off the polysyndeton suddenly with an asyndeton that assigns the blame for Rome's fall to her own cursed bloodline (*impia perdemus devoti sanguinis aetas*, 9). The inclusive prophetic future, "we will destroy" (*perdemus*), and the repetition of *aetas* from the opening line damn the entire Roman race. The iambist reaches the same conclusion that he does at the end of epode 7. Rome has been working out her own fated self-annihilation ever since Romulus murdered his brother Remus (*sic est: acerba fata Romanos agunt / scelusque fraternae necis*, 7.17–18).[4] If this were not bleak enough—Romulus killing Remus—Rome's deified founder, *Romulus Quirinus*, will not survive the conquering barbarian who will desecrate his bones (16.11–14).

The review of Rome's enemies reinforces the inevitability of her fall and her impiety that caused it (3–8). The iambist arranges history in a cyclical order so that very literally the violence repeats and perpetuates itself (Social War, 91–88 BC; Lars Porsena, 510 BC; Capua's desertion to Hannibal after Cannae, 216–211 BC; Spartacus, 73–71, BC; the revolts of the Allobroges, 66, 61 BC; the Cimbri and Teutones, 105, 102–101 BC; Hannibal and the Second Punic War, 218–201 BC).[5] And what looks at first like foreign war actually centers at least partially on

[3] The Carthaginians sent the captured M. Atilius Regulus back to Rome on parole to present their terms for peace. Regulus, urging that the offer be rejected and sealing his own fate, convinced the Romans that her soldiers once defeated would not have the necessary will to trample the Carthaginians in a second war (*erit ille fortis / qui perfidis se credidit hostibus, / et Marte Poenos* ***proteret altero***, */ … † hic † unde vitam sumeret inscius / pacem duello miscuit?*, *C.* III.5.32b–34, 37–38a).

[4] For the curse of Romulus in epode 16, see Thummer (1962: 343–346).

[5] Horace prefers a cyclical view of history (e.g., *C.* II.1.21–36); see Johnson, 2009: 317.

internal affairs, since these conflicts the iambist selects all involve domestic unrest. The nearby Marsians led Rome's other allied cities in a fight for the privileges of citizen-rights. Rome exiled her Tarquin king, and Porsena attacked the city in an attempt to restore him. The spirited slave Spartacus rallied his forces from the disenfranchised poor in the Italian countryside. The Gallic tribe, the Allobroges, took every opportunity to revolt against Rome, but Catiline could not trust them to keep his own civil conspiracy against the city a secret (*novisque rebus infidelis Allobrox*, 6).[6] Horace's history excuses Rome's enemies (*quam* [*Romam*] *neque … valuerunt perdere*; *nec … domuit*, "they did not destroy nor tame") and his prophecy locates martial violence within Rome herself. Rome's very name, *ipsa Roma*, speaks against her: "Rome," "strength" (ῥώμη), is being destroyed by her own strength (*suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit*, 2).[7] Rome is being true to herself, acting out her name. Horace is not wasting a pun on cleverness. All the conflicts listed are Roman victories, but Rome's success in these wars results in her ascendancy and simultaneously guarantees her demise. The transition from civil wars (1–2) on into the compressed history of Rome's external/internal conflicts argues that when a society disposed to violence disposes of its enemies, it will turn on itself,[8] and therefore even when Rome wins wars, she loses. "We will destroy" (*perdemus*, 9). The iambist foresees for Rome an impending disaster that echoes the buried boy's curse against Canidia (5.91–102). The Roman youth suffered a horrific transformation into an avenging Fury, perched on the witches' chests and clawing their faces (*petamque vultus umbra curvis unguibus*, 5.93). He promised the witches that people would stone them and animals tear apart their unburied bodies. Rome has no outside

[6] Although the context requires the Allobroges to be plotting against Rome and does not refer to their role as informants in the Catilinarian conspiracy, could any informed Roman audience pass over *novis rebus* ("revolution") and not think of the conspiracy, which put the Allobroges "in the news" (compare Watson, 2003: 492; Drexler, 1962: 40)? The Allobroges would perhaps, therefore, call to mind Sallust's *Catiline* (recent for the *Epodes*) and invoke his pessimism; on Sallust as a key author for the *Epodes*, see Nisbet (1984: 4–8, 15).

[7] On Horace's source for this pun (*suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit*, v.2), *Orac. Sibyll.* 3.363–364 (ἐσεῖται … καὶ Ῥώμη ῥύμη; cf. *Orac. Sibyll.* 8.165–166), and the Sibylline styling of the epode, see Macleod (1979: 220–221) and Harrison (2007b: 132–134); *ferisque rursus occupabitur solum*, v.10 (καὶ σὰ θέμειλα λύκοι καὶ ἀλώπεκες οἰκήσουσιν., *Orac. Sibyll.* 8.41).

[8] The corrupting power of peace and prosperity is a common theme: e.g., *C.* III.4.65–68 (cf. Liv. 30.44.8: *nulla magna civitas diu quiescere potest; si foris hostem non habet, domi invenit, ut praevalida corpora ab externis causis tuta videntur, suis ipsa viribus onerantur*); see Macleod's (1979: 221 n.2) list of parallels.

assailant to blame and curse, and so there is nothing for her future but utter subjection and desolation: a foreign conqueror standing on Rome's ashes, horse hooves trampling (*eques sonante verberabit ungula*, 16.12), animals roaming at will, the scattering of Quirinus' bones.[9]

Rome has fallen into such an irreparable state of strife that she is no longer safe from herself. She is not viable now or in the future. Therefore, the iambist invites his fellow citizens to start a new and symbolic literary journey with him to a very different destination than in epode 1. The iambist will not travel into war but this time away from Rome and her warring to the Isles of the Blessed (*petamus arva, divites et insulas*, 16.42). Whereas epode 1 operated on the basis of loyalty to military oaths, honorable whether or not the comrades who took them would survive, in epode 16 the iambist turns an oath for safe return upside down into a counter-oath that it will never be safe for the Romans to go back home (*exsecrata civitas … ire, … iuremus … eamus omnis exsecrata civitas*, 16.18b–36).[10] He calls on the Romans to swear that, if ever a return becomes possible, rocks will float, the northern Po will wash over the southern Matinian peaks, the Apennines in central Italy will run out into the sea, tigers will mate with deer and doves with kites, lions will not frighten herds, goats will grow scales and swim in the sea (25–36). The result is a distorted type of invective against the Italian landscape. The counter-oath, if a return to Rome would ever prove safe, would become a curse that would wreck the topography for all of Italy, mixing north and south, land and sea. Further, the oath calls into question the typical formulaic utopia, which imagines the end of all natural hostility among the

---

[9] Cf. Horace's portrayal of the warring Tiberius (*C.* IV.14.17–32).

[10] A Roman precedent was available in Quintus Sertorius' fancy to quit his fight against Rome and flee to the Blessed Isles (Sall. *Hist.* 1.99–104 Maurenbrecher; Ps.-Acro ad 41; cf. Ableitinger-Grünberger, 1971: 67–68; Rebuffat, 1976: 881; Watson, 2003: 480–481), but Horace skips the more contemporary and cites the Phocaeans (v.17), who abandoned their home to the conquering Persians and sailed to Corsica (540 BC; Hdt. 1.163–168). The Phocaeans are distant enough to accentuate the legendary quality of the Isles of the Blessed, historic enough to give the proposal plausibility and a noble example. Watson (2003: 500) reads *profugit* not *exsecrata* governing *agros* and *Lares* (17–19), so that the Phocaeans curse themselves not their homeland, if they return. Horace, however, does not leave the oath so straightforward, because after giving what amounts to a curse against the homeland should the Romans ever be able to return, Horace repeats *exsecrata* (36). The cursing of the homeland does seem to be implied. The Phocaeans redeem their land by cursing it for a foreign enemy to whom they were forced to abandon it. Horace in effect has the Romans curse a land destroyed at their own hands. The Romans in the oath have to voice their own guilt.

animals, by instead insinuating the assumption behind Neaera's tricky oath that insisted on the eternality of enmity, when the iambist made her swear that she would love him as long as the wolf hated the flock and Orion stayed hostile to the sailor (epode 15.3–9). The irony in epode 16 is that the only way to implement the oath so as to preserve Rome and her people in some fashion is to abandon her permanently to the boars and the wolves (v.20), the very symbols of iambic rage. Within the cycle of perpetual violence there comes a time when all that survives are wolves.

If this is not enough of a reversal, Horace has a bigger surprise. After rejecting the possibility of one standard expression of utopia (vv.25–34: the re-ordering of the natural world), he promises another, more idealized and *meta*-mythic (43–66).[11] Horace, as typical in descriptions of utopias, defines his idyllic world by negation, the absence of any labor whatsoever.[12] The sequence of negatives (fourteen in all, 43–62) renders the *kosmos* tranquil, both earth and sky: fields unplowed and vines unpruned; flocks coming to be milked without their master's call; no bear on the prowl and no snakes on the ground; no floods, no drought; no disease and no blazing dog-star.[13] The positives in the vision express the outlandish sumptuousness of the earth's produce. Figs decorate trees; honey flows from oaks; water nimbly dances down high mountains (46–48). Alfius' day-dreamed bucolic paradise pales by comparison (epode 2).[14] All that loan-shark, captured as he was by the work-profit mentality, could envision was a land that responded well to the farmer's labor. Land

[11] Much of the bibliography on epode 16 concerns the priority of Vergil's eclogue 4 or the epode (see Ableitinger-Gruenberger, 1971: 66 n.1; Setaioli, 1981: 1744–1762; contrast Snell, 1938: 237–242; Barra, 1973: 22–50; Clausen, 1994: 145–150). Which poet is reacting to the other? The majority see the "junior" member of the circle reacting to his "senior:" a pessimistic Horace corrects the optimistic Vergilian construct (compare Smolenaars, 1987: 391–405). I too would guess that Horace follows Vergil, since Horace presents competing utopian views and rejects the lesser in favor of a more idyllic, which implies that Horace is accentuating Vergil's optimism. This point would be more convincing, if Horace confined all the Vergilian parallels to the *adynata*. He does not (ecl. 4.21–22; epode 16.33, 49–50).

[12] For example, see Watson (2003: 483) on Homer's use of the negative when portraying the Elysian Plain (οὐ νιφετός, οὔτ' ἂρ' χειμὼν πολὺς οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρος., *Od.* 4.566).

[13] *Nulla nocent pecori contagia, nullius astri / gregem aestuosa torret impotentia* (61–62). When Horace renders the hot fury (*impotentia*) of the dog-star "powerless" (*impotentia*), his play on the double-meaning of the word undoes a primary symbol of untamable (*impotentia*) iambic rage and challenges the canicular Canidia; cf. Olienis (1998: 78–79, 94–99).

[14] Commentaries often compare Alfius' countryside with Horace's utopian view. For a point-by-point contrast, see epode 2, Chapter 2.

productive through labor would be a fine enough world for Alfius.[15] Horace gives Rome a vision that transcends the work-for-reward ethic. The Blessed Isles, therefore, represent a "Garden of Eden" paradise where life does not require work. This is a world before any curse, before any motivations to use warring and plundering to gain material.

Accordingly Horace prophesies that the Romans will rediscover at the Blessed Isles the heroic golden age but better, because his description of the new world rules out any mythic conflict (57–60): no Argonauts, no Medea, no Phoenicians, no Ulysses' crew. This grouping symbolizes the extremes of human effort, treachery, and loss. The invention of the ship should have brought fine advances for humanity; instead, mighty men put to sea for gold, daughters were taken captive, wars broke out, cities fell, and crews died far from home.[16] Horace now foresees a new state superior to any mythic past, so that the Lands of the Blessed appeal more through their other-worldliness than reality. Horace's genius recognizes that the most appealing argument for the Romans, worn out by the evil labors of their warfare, would not weigh itself down with realities: "Where there is no vision the people perish" (Prov. 29.18). Even if paradise were not real, who would not dream of going there? Yet, admitting that premise acknowledges the degradation of life's present circumstances, and so stresses the need for change. The reality behind the iambist's imagined world, then, becomes how to leave the old and gain admission to the new (*Forte quid expediat communiter aut melior pars / malis carere quaeritis laboribus*, 15–16).[17]

---

[15] See Smolenaars (1987: 391–405) on the presence of labor in Vergil's depictions of the golden age.

[16] By comparison to the others in the group the Phoenicians appear innocent, but they had a reputation for piracy and plunder; cf. Hdt. 1.1–2: the Persians said the entire conflict between Greece and the East started when the Phoenicians landed at Argos and kidnapped Io and other Greek women. The Greeks retaliated by kidnapping the Phoenician king's daughter, Europa, and then pushed hostilities further when they made off with Medea, the daughter of Colchis' king, during the expedition of the Argonauts. Next Priam's son Alexander took Helen. Horace reduces the beginning of Herodotus' *History* to the names (Argonauts, Medea, Phoenicians, Ulysses); see Harrison, 1989: 273–274.

[17] Utopian views hide very particular ethics in their artificial fantasies, for instance, social justice through communism (Ferguson, 1975: 16–39: "DREAMS MUST ALWAYS BE SEEN AGAINST THE BACKGROUND of reality," 23). Horace's vision may have a universal rather than exclusively Roman appeal, if, in a context that parades the quarrels dividing east and west (the Phoenicians, Greeks, and Persians, 57–60), he brings east and west together by incorporating as the one positive description of his utopia the Hebraic tradition of the promised land flowing with milk and honey (Wimmel, 1953: 330: Drexler, 1964: 180). Rome's civil wars would become only one instance of the human

The invitation to flee Rome under the iambist's prophetic vision operates on the basis of an insider versus outsider dichotomy, which redefines iambic power. Sailing to the Isles of the Blessed is an exclusive journey. The Isles always existed, separated off (*secrevit*) for a chosen people (*Iuppiter illa piae secrevit litora genti, / ut inquinavit aere tempus aureum.*, 63–64). The iambist understands this. He transitions from the details of Rome's propensity for violence into his proposal to abandon the city with a series of questions (15–24), provoking the Romans to consider the validity of his plan. The questions are too open ended to be a mere rhetorical ploy to affirm agreement on a course of action. Even we, who are not caught in the emotional conflict involved in the desecration and abandonment of our homeland, find it hard to decide whether to take Horace's summons to leave Rome seriously or to read him ironically, as if he were an Agamemnon testing his weary troops by suggesting that the Argives give up on Troy and sail home (Hom. *Il.* 2.1–210).[18] Horace's questions force a decision in which the audience must take sides either to leave with the iambist or to stay the course at Rome. He assumes that he will persuade only a select group. Twice when he appeals to the whole

propensity to acquire goods and power via warfare, and Horace would be imagining a united world without any tendency toward strife. Fraenkel (1957: 49–50, n.3) rejects any eastern influences for Horace's utopia and focuses on the Hellenistic writers of fantastic island utopias (Euhemerus [Panchaia and Hiera, *FGrH* 63 F2]; Hecat. Abd. [Island of the Hyperboreans, *FGrH* 264 F7]; Dionysius Scytobrachion [Nysa and Hespera, *FGrH* 32 F7]; Iambulus [Islands of the Sun, D.S. 2.55–60; Lucian *Ver. Hist.* 1.3]; see Brown, 1946: 259–272; Ferguson, 1975: 104–108, 122–129; Gabba, 1981: 50–60; Constantakopoulou, 2005: 3). Watson (2003: 483–484) notes that the Isles were at times identified with actual places, such as the Canary Islands. Horace's Blessed Isles, however, need no physical locale to have a real appeal. In fact, the more out of reach they are from the harsh realities of life and war the more alluring and universal they become.

[18] Watson, 2003: 484: "It has often been remarked that *Epode* 16 is shot through with ironies" (citing Plüss, 1897: 73–80; Kukula, 1911: 16–25; Fuchs, 1954: 38; Wimmel, 1953: 329–330; Cávarzere, 1994: 171–190). Irony does not put the iambist in any safer position. Like Agamemnon he may find citizens, so to speak, running for the shore. Irony misunderstood can be disastrous. Compare Fraenkel's (1957: 46) reply: "The epode, so they argue is ironic … This idea could never occur to a reader sensitive to the tone of the poem." In spite of Fraenkel's certainty, the structure of Horace's speech does not make his questions, all irony aside, any easier to evaluate. Horace incorporates some legal phrasing that brings to mind a Roman political setting, but does not follow through so that the setting fits the procedural details for either the assemblies or senate (Fraenkel, 43–44). Cávarzere sees enough disorder to argue that Horace imitates a nearly irrational Greek political harangue, and therefore should not be taken seriously. To solve the dispute lessens the impact of Horace's proposal: since he makes the speech plausible but not completely credible, he puts the full weight of a decision on the audience.

citizen body, he immediately downsizes the whole to a special few (*communiter aut melior pars*, 15; *omnis ... civitas, / aut pars ... melior*, 36–37). Many, if not most, will not follow him.

There is no gray area between the two groups. The iambist assigns high noble moral terms to those who will take the journey with him. They are better, blessed, pious (*melior pars*, 15, 37; *felices*, 53; *quorum / piis secunda vate me datur fuga*, 65b–66).[19] Those deciding to stay behind he labels an unlearned herd, soft, (*indocili ... grege. mollis*, 37), and insinuates they are cursed "couch-potatoes" (*inominata perpremat cubilia*, 38), who wail like women (*muliebrem tollite luctum*, 39)—and the soft are without hope (*mollis et exspes*, 37).[20] Such a characterization fully reverses the symbols of iambic power, since the "soft" (*mollis*) are those who choose to stay in a Rome caught in a cycle of retaliatory vengeance, a fit home for ravenous wolves, and who are incapable of seeing the need to formulate a new world. Staying entrenched in "Rome as it is" holds only negative consequences, making it natural for Horace to wish all his people would go with him together, even though he knows that this will not be the case. Consequently, to interpret iambic as partisan, the use of invective to manipulate and dominate (*agentia verba Lycamben*), misunderstands how the iambic Horace defines softness, as the insistence to be obsessed with rage and the failure to engage change, and how thoroughly he rejects this softness/lack of vision as the defining quality and *telos* for his iambic. To escape Rome's ruin requires imagining a new type of iambic vitality.

The traditional conception of Archilochean-Lykambid iambic, which minimizes iambic's religious contexts and its power to transform, reduces epode 16 to a puzzle with mismatched pieces.[21] How can the iambist declare the entire Roman race impious beyond recovery and then within a few lines sail off to the Happy Lands reserved for the pious with all those choosing to go with him? How can he, with any sense of sincerity, advise allowing the violation of his homeland and sacred temples (compare Camillus' speech that it would be a sacrilege to abandon Rome, Liv. 5.51–55: *movisse eos Camillus cum alia oratione, tum ea quae ad religiones*

[19] Horace's attention to piety-impiety in a poem interacting so strongly with Vergil gives another clue that Horace was probably well aware of Vergil's *pius Aeneas* at the earliest stages of composition.

[20] The *ex*-prefix throughout emphasizes separation and loss (*expediat*, 15; *exsecrata*, 18, 36; *mollis et exspes*, 37).

[21] Horace's move to include in his iambic the power to envision a world beyond the present wars provides some balance to the general agreement about the epode's bleak pessimism (Watson, 2003 479: "One of the few things upon which critics of *Epode* 16 are agreed is the exceeding bleakness of its message.").

pertinebat maxime dicitur, 5.55.1.1–2)?[22] A journey to the Isles of the Blessed is potent religious metaphor, which first necessitates a death and then a resurrection, a leaving behind of the old for the new. The contrast between a decimated, depopulated Rome and a prosperous world of peace perfectly symbolizes the combination in archaic ritual of rage/laughter—death/rebirth, and explains why Horace as an iambist dares to be so bold when he is up against the endless horrors of civil war. He pronounces himself prophet-priest and declares sacrosanct his capacity to realize a world not torn apart by warfare (*piis secunda vate me datur fuga*, 66).[23] The move from the pessimistic to the fantastic, warring/destruction to peace/plenty, depicts the possibility for renewal, of a "life" after a "death," which the iambist enacts through his poetry. This, of course, means that "leaving" can be a good; those infected before with impiety can be become the pious, who will make the journey and not pollute the Islands when they arrive.

The religious words pervading the epode, therefore, are not incidental (*infidelis*, 6; *abominatus*, 8; *impia*, *devoti*, 9; *nefas videre*, 14; *exsecrata*, 18, 36; *iuremus*, 25; *nefas*, 26; *inominata*, 38; *piae secrevit*, 63; *piis ... vate me*, 66). This song is Horace's most overt representation of his iambic as ritual and it caps the most intense series of iambic responsions in the book (epodes 8–15). In epode 16 Horatian iambic embodies Eleusinian mystery by projecting a moment of hopefulness. In a sense, Demeter (grieving Rome) meets Iambe (Horace). Through his prophetic announcement Horace presents himself as the one who knows (Ἰάμβη κέδν' εἰδυῖα) how to confront Rome and lead her out of her warring mentality and pain. Such a claim is not indicative of a reticent iambist doubting the efficacy of his craft, but one having the nerve to offer up his *carmen* as the positive force needed to reconstitute society. Horace's iambic criticism aims at nothing less than social reconstruction, and the responsions within it are part of the remedy in that they counter the monolithic and entrenched hostility of the Lykambid tradition.

[22] These are some of the incongruities Watson notes (2003: 484–485).

[23] *Vate me* could contain a conditional force, but "conditional" need not convey reticence in the iambist's voice. It can just as well denote that he is the one to lead the way; cf. Cávarzere, 1994: 188. To assign a pejorative meaning to *vates*, a superstitious deceiver (see Enn. *Ann.* 7.206–208; 13.374; *Trag.* fr. 332–336; Cic. *Div.* 2.12; Lucr. 1.102–106), requires reversing all of the iambist-prophet's moral language, as well as dismissing his prophecy against Rome and her civil warring; n.b. the opening prophetic future (*perdemus*, 9) and the culminating prophetic "I" (*vate me*, 66).

Horace's Duet with Canidia (Epode 17)

Any idealism at the conclusion of epode 16—the iambist-bard in charge leading his passengers away from their old country, filled with wolves, on to a new harmonious world—finds its match in epode 17. Now the iambist meets and exchanges words with Canidia, the witchy personification of unrelenting rage and revenge, who is obsessed with her brand of magic. Horatian iambic comes down to this dialogue and the question as to the degree Horace falls silent, when faced with Canidia?[24] One answer is that any impotence Horace professes wins him sympathy and exposes how bewitching and harmful the disposition to vengeance is. However repulsive (or not) Canidia's blackness may be, it is hard to extract from an ironic perspective (the potency of impotency) a pure positive value for Horace's iambic criticism that would validate the power he claims in epode 16 and justify the pride he later shows in his achievement.

If irony is all there is to this end-game, then we could also expect a corresponding clean break between Horace's iambic and lyric poetry, because they represent mutually exclusive types. In *Epistle* I.19, however, as I argued early in Chapter 1 ("On Not Hunting Down Lykambes"), Horace ties his iambic and lyric achievement together to defend the originality of his *Epodes*. Further, Horace at first rages against the imitators, but by the end of the epistle he again meets his match, an imagined interlocutor with sharp claws included—not unlike Canidia—who questions Horace's refusal to perform his poetry and doubts his literary modesty (19.40–45a). Horace protests:

---

[24] The question controlling the debate over epode 17, "How serious or ironic is Horace's surrender to Canidia?" (see, e.g., Campbell, 1924: 140; Cairns, 1978: 549), has only recently begun to change. Barchiesi (2009: 232–242) shifts the conversation by recognizing the reciprocity in the magical *carmen* shared by Horace and Canidia. He describes epode 17 as a checkmate between *epodoi* and *epodai* (242). I am also indebted to Oliensis' insightful work on Canidia and her symbolic value (1998: 90: "… Canidia and Maecenas form in effect a single corporate whole. Horace's relation to Maecenas is not the solution to *impotentia* but part of the problem."; also Oliensis ends her discussion of the *Epodes* by transitioning to Horace's lyrics, specifically *C.* III.13, 1998: 98–101). Therefore, I do not mean to misrepresent her reading of epode 17 by underestimating the significance of silence in the *Epodes* (1998: 96): "By yielding the field to Canidia, by declining to respond to her outburst with an outburst of his own, Horace puts an end to the endless game and arrests the perpetual motion of the invective machine. What follows Canidia's final vaunt is the silence of potency …". Compare Lowrie (2009b: 111). She gives the upper hand to Horace, because he is not self-deluded. In the *Epodes*, the lyre and Canidia with her spells are both impotent. "The difference is: he [Horace] knows it and makes it a poetic topic."

… ad haec ego naribus uti
formido et, luctantis acuto ne secer ungui,
'displicet iste locus' clamo et diludia posco.
ludus enim genuit trepidum certamen et iram,
ira truces inimicitias et funebre bellum. (19.45b–49)

To this response I am afraid to stick up my nose and, so that my opponent does not cut me with his sharp nail as we wrestle, I shout, "That position you have is unfair," and I demand a change. For sport has produced terrifying strife and anger, anger has produced vicious enmity and deadly war.

Horace's use of angry name-calling (*O imitatores*, *servum pecus*, 19.19) as a prelude to a verbal give-and-take (19.40–49), which itself includes images of a wrestling match and ends by asserting the dangers of unfair advantage and unchecked rage, calls for another look at his capitulation in epode 17.[25] What does Horace mean when he demands a change in the circumstances of the fight (19.47)?[26] Just how should Horace's surrender to Canidia be characterized? Certainly invective with an intent to harm (via Canidia) literally has the last word in the *Epodes*, but Horace's lyre crosses into the witch's territory (transgression) enough to rouse her ire and force her to answer back seriously (responsion), so that Horace's final iambic, just as he models in the epistle, operates on the basis of exchange, in this case a call and response exploiting touch-points established by the "wrestling" (*luctor*; συμπλοκή) of the two singers.[27] When the lyre wields this power against Canidia's rage, it predicts that the potency of

[25] Likewise, Ariston argues in the case against Conon that abusive speech needs restraints or it degenerates into violence: μηδὲ κατὰ μικρὸν ὑπάγεσθαι ἐκ μὲν λοιδορίας εἰς πληγάς, ἐκ δὲ πληγῶν εἰς τραύματα, ἐκ δὲ τραυμάτων εἰς θάνατον (D. 54.19); see Chapter 2.

[26] Lowrie (2009b: 256–258) takes the fight to be Horace's rejection of poetry as social spectacle through which a poet works to gain position and status.

[27] See Introduction for definitions of transgression, responsion, and fusion. The various connotations of συμπλοκή (*LSJ*) encapsulate the whole process: "wrestling" or "close combat" (Pl. *Lg.* 833a), but also sexual intercourse (Pl. *Sym.* 191c); letters forming words and words propositions (Pl. *Plt.* 278b); mental conceptions to form one entity (Arist. *de An.* 428a5); cf. *luctor*, Isid. *Orig.* 19.19: crossbeams, "holding each other up like wrestlers," which through opposition form a unified support system (*luctantes, quod erecti invicem se teneant more luctantium*). Barchiesi (2009: 246) names Canidia the "black Muse of iambic." You may not like Canidia, but in Horace's iambic you must have her. The precision in Horace's and Canidia's reply and response is like amoebean song, a formulation impossible without rival and complementary voices (Barchiesi, 233 n.4). I hesitate to designate epode 17 the "*finale*" (Barchiesi, 235), since *C.* I.16 continues the responsion by repeating again backwards Canidia's primary exempla; see c.16 in Chapter 5.

Horace's iambic criticism lies in its lyric modality, a singing back and forth, Horace's *recantatis … opprobriis* (*C.* I.16.27–28), the subject for the next chapter.

Meanwhile, Horace's opening lines hold out to Canidia unconditional surrender:

> Iam iam efficaci do manus scientiae,
> supplex et oro regna per Proserpinae,
> per et Dianae non movenda numina,[28]
> per atque libros carminum valentium
> refixa caelo devocare sidera, (epode 17.1–5)

> Now, now I am surrendering to your irresistible expertise, and I, a suppliant, beg by Proserpina's kingdom, and by Diana's steadfast majesty, and by the books of spells powerful enough to call down the stars fixed in the sky.

Horace (*Iam iam efficaci do manus* ***scientiae***, 17.1) reuses and reverses Canidia's admission that her potion to gain Varus' love had proven ineffective against a witchier rival (*a! a! solutus ambulat veneficae /* ***scientioris*** *carmine*, epode 5.71–72) to present Canidia as an enchantress without peer. There is no sorceress more effective in her craft than Canidia. Horace's plea also mimics a military surrender to stronger forces (*supplex … regna per*). Perhaps, Maecenas was right to question Horace's power in epode 1.15–16, since his iambic effort, no matter how loyal, appears too weak to win the war in the end. Nonetheless, by the time Canidia replies to Horace, she is in a foul mood. What outrages Canidia the most is that Horace's surrender never quite materializes as she would expect it should.

Horace recognizes Canidia's power, but he is not afraid to speak. He does not relinquish the role of iambic narrator to her for over half of the poem, 52 verses. And so she waits her turn, while Horace crosses into her territory, beginning his extended rejoinder to her supremacy by mimicking a counter-spell:

> Canidia, parce vocibus tandem sacris
> citumque retro solve, solve turbinem. (6–7)

> Canidia, stop at last your incantations, and set, set the spinning wheel spinning backwards.

---

[28] Campbell's proposed emendation (1945: ad loc.), "loquenda nomina" (which S.B. prints), is not convincing enough to disregard the plain sense of the manuscripts (*movenda numina*). Further, *non movenda … movit* (3, 8) provides a fine rhetorical repetition, showing Horace's determination to persuade in spite of the odds.

Just as if he were the witch, Horace invokes Proserpina and Diana, divinities of the underworld and the night, and the books of spells calling the stars down from the sky (1–5; cf. Canidia in epode 5.45–46, 51–52). He then calls on his opponent by name, Canidia, and gives two parallel commands: "stop" and "reverse" (*parce ... retro solve*). The second of the commands forms a rhyming chant anchored with a mid-line anadiplosis demanding that Canidia give up her exclusive hold on ritual power (*citumque retro solve, solve turbinem.*) Horace's petition (*supplex et oro*, 2), as it continues on, gives little indication of standard prayer-form, but imitates the intonation and patterning for a magic spell, which happens, like the second half of the *Epodes*, to test in turn the effectiveness of epic, elegy, and lyric to hold court with iambic. Horace's whole approach, surrender and all, represents a multiplex, magical poetic reply (*carmen*) to Canidia's single-minded rant and rave.[29]

Horace launches his magical generic subterfuge by complicating his opening military-styled surrender. Like a good military poet (epicist), he counters Canidia's spells with heroic exempla (8–18), complete with a patronymic (*nepotem ... Nereium* = Achilles, 8) and Homeric-styled epithets (*superbus* [Achilles], 9; *homicidam Hectorem*, 12; *pervicacis ... Achillei*, 14; *laboriosi Ulixei*, 16). Horace keeps his main point simple. Even epic heroes do not hold on to their anger forever. First, comes the *Iliad*. Horace has Achilles relent twice (Telephus / Priam), which conveniently offsets the two embassies that approached Achilles in *Iliad* 9 and failed to appease his wrath. Telephus, the Mysian king, was wounded in battle by Achilles and could only be cured with the rust from his enemy Achilles' spear. Achilles took pity and cured him.[30] When Priam fell before the feet of Achilles and begged to be able to bury his son's body, hard-hearted Achilles released the body of Hector, although he had pledged that his enemy would be food for birds and dogs (*Il.* 23.182–183;

[29] A magical tone pervades the entire epode, appropriately so, since Canidia is always and foremost a witch (Barchiesi, 2009: 234–236). Barchiesi notes the rhythmic language, the theme of "undoing," and compares the heroic exempla Horace cites to the mythological *historiolae* in magical incantations.

[30] The Telephus-legend was known from the Homeric Cycle (*Cypria*) and Euripides' *Telephus* (see Watson, 2003: 547); for a full description of Horace's epic and tragic diction, see Watson (547–552). The *Iliad* ends with the sounds of women mourning (*Il.* 24.722–725); Horace starts there (*luxere matres Iliae*, 17.11a). I agree with Brink (1982b: 44–47), S.B., and Watson that *luxere* is preferred, but Barchiesi's (2009: n.4) arguments for *unxere* are compelling.

24.329–510).[31] Achilles, whose rage provides the thesis for Homer's epic, shows mercy. Second, comes the *Odyssey*. The witch Circe, one of Canidia's own, returned Odysseus' men to human form. These epic *exempla* lead logically one to the other, as though given by a shrewd orator building his case that enemies have much in common, and therefore should be willing to rein in hostilities (Telephus needs Achilles; Achilles' heart softens in front of Priam), but then the Odyssean example turns witchy. Circe undoes her spell against Odysseus' crew, but Odysseus also shared her bed to persuade her to do so (*Od.* 10.333–387). To put the iambist's argument bluntly, his epic plot ends up with the hero in bed with a witch. Horace anticipates the innuendo (which, by the way, he has helped create by his use of magical discourse), because he immediately objects that he has already paid enough and more than enough of a penalty to Canidia (*dedi satis superque poenarum tibi*, 19). While he would like to imagine that Canidia like Circe will leave him be and he like Odysseus has the strength to leave the witch behind, his words to Canidia recall his reaction to Maecenas' benefactions in epode 1 (*satis superque me benignitas tua / ditavit*, v.31–32a). If Horace could not resist the riches of friendship and its attendant obligations, which called him to war, what are his chances of handling well the blackness of Canidian iambic? Horace's linking of the epic exempla with a reference to the kindnesses given by Maecenas effects a sophisticated transition from blood and warfare to desire and irresistible seduction. At this point, just as the power of epic against the vengeful Canidia begins to wane, Horace blends epic into elegy.

Horace begins talking to Canidia as if she were his faithless elegiac beloved, trading her love like cheap merchandise to sailors and peddlers (*amata nautis multum et institoribus*, 20; cf. Lesbia, Cat. 58 and 72), and he were the stereotypical rejected lover. Horace suffers from lovesickness (21–26); his youthful complexion has faded (*fugit iuventas et verecundus color*, 21; cf. Ligurinus, *C.* IV.10.4); his yellow skin clings to his bones as he wastes away (*relinquor ossa pelle amicta lurida*, 22); his hair has gone white (*tuis capillus albus est odoribus*, 23); he cannot rest (*nullum a labore me reclinat otium*; / *urget diem nox et dies noctem*, 24–25a); he is too worn out to catch his breath (*neque est / levare tenta spiritu praecordia*, 25b–26). Canidia's rule has turned Horace into a scrawny, sickly old man,

[31] Angry Achilles and suppliant Priam hold a poignant reminder for Canidia about the dangers of rage. The boy cursing Canidia, at the end of epode 5, was as mad at Canidia as Achilles at Hector: *post insepulta membra different lupi / et Esquilinae alites, / neque hoc parentes, heu, mihi superstites / effugerit spectaculum.*, 5.99–102.

and he admits with exaggerated metaphors that she torments him (27–30a). He burns more than Hercules, set afire by the cloak given him by his deceived lover, and more than fiery Mt. Aetna.[32] Canidia's potions contain the magic of Medea, who was Canidia's potion-master in epode 5 when her spell failed the first time to work on Varus (*calet venenis officina Colchicis?*, 17.35; *quid accidit? cur dira barbarae minus / venena Medeae valent*, 5.61–62). Horace knows that if Canidia is anything like her teacher, she will not relent, and therefore he issues the exasperated response similar to the one leveled against his sexual aggressor in epode 12 (*quid tibi vis*, 1a), but he intensifies it for Canidia (*quid amplius vis?*, 30). Like epic, the elegiac drama leaves the poet at the mercy of his witchy lover.

Confronted by such a strong opponent, Horace restates his surrender (36–39a): complete obsequiousness expressed in military terms (*quae finis aut quod me manet stipendium? / effare*, 36–37a) and resulting in ritual homage (*iussas cum fide poenas luam, / paratus expiare seu poposceris / centum iuvencis*, 37b–39a). Yet, just as after his earlier capitulation, Horace is not undone and shows that he has another generic register to engage Canidia. He offers his lyre in praise of Canidia, a liar-lyre (*mendaci lyra*, 39) which in double-tongued-fashion sets about reworking the iambic Catullus:

> Adeste, hendecasyllabi, quot estis
> omnes, undique, quotquot estis omnes.
> iocum me putat esse moecha turpis,
> et negat mihi nostra reddituram
> pugillaria, si pati potestis.
> persequamur eam et reflagitemus.
>
> mutandast ratio modusque vobis,
> siquid proficere amplius potestis,
> "*pudica et proba*, redde codicillos!" (Cat. 42.1–6, 22–24)

> Be present, hendecasyllables, wherever you all are, however many you all are. A filthy adulteress thinks me a joke and says that she will not give me back our writing tablets, if you can stand for that. Let's track her down and demand them back.
>
> Your strategy and your form, you must change, if you are to make any headway at all: "Chaste and honorable, return my writing tablets."

[32] *Ardeo / quantum neque atro delibutus Hercules / Nessi cruore*, 30b–32a: Canidia, unlike "man-killing" Deianira (S. *Tr.* 1112–1142), knows exactly what she is doing with her potions.

hic, liquidi vario ne solum in lumine caeli
ex Ariadnaeis aurea temporibus
fixa corona foret, sed nos quoque fulgeremus
devotae flavi verticis exuviae,
uvidulam a fluctu cedentem ad templa deum me
sidus in antiquis diva novum posuit. (Cat. 66.59–64)

Hereupon, not only that the golden crown from Ariadne's brow be set among the various lights of the clear sky, but that we also shine, the dedicated spoils from Berenice's golden head, the goddess set me, soaked from the surge, arriving at the precinct of the gods, a new among the ancient stars.

... sive mendaci lyra
voles sonari, *tu pudica, tu proba*
perambulabis astra sidus aureum. (epode 17.39–41)

or if you desire to be sung of with a lying lyre, you are chaste, you are honorable, you will walk midst the stars, a golden constellation.

Catullus calls on his hendecasyllables to track down (*persequamur*, 6) a woman who made off with his tablets, presumably because he had written on them an invective against her. When his name-calling, repeated like an incantation ("*moecha putida, redde codicillos / redde, putida moecha, codicillos*," 11–12, 19–20), has no effect, he changes his line of attack and praises her ("*pudica et proba*," 24a). Swap out "t," "d," and "c" (*putida*: *pudica*) and Catullus' woman in the space of a few verses reverses character from shameless to chaste. This rhyming sleight of hand can only be sarcastic pandering meant to seduce and ridicule a woman whom Catullus presents as so unsophisticated that she might believe his insincerity. Horace, likewise feigns. His allusive *contaminatio* of Catullus 42 (*tu pudica, tu proba*, epode 17.40b) with a hyperbolic katasterism forces Canidia to eat the Catullan pointed sarcasm with the praise.[33] Like the lock of Berenice, Canidia will walk among the stars, a golden constellation, chaste and honorable—a witch of the heavens. "Right!" Yet, something serious emerges from Horace's play with Catullus beyond reducing Canidia to an exaggerated mythic motif. Catullus' last address to his hendecasyllables, "Your strategy and form you must change" (*mutandast ratio modusque vobis*), allows Horace to introduce through the allusion

[33] Barchiesi (2009: 235–239) compares the katasterism of Canidia to Callimachus' *Ektheosis of Arsinoe* and that of Helen, and he notes that Helen's star could either rescue sailors or be a herald of their death. This only complicates the lyre's double-speak ("reversibility") by making the katasterism a symbol of praise and blame.

the notion that there may be a poetic strategy more potent in its persuasion than one-sided verbal shaming. Horace is notifying Canidia via Catullus that a change is in the making. This in epode 17 would be the lyric modality (responsive nature) of Horace's iambics, represented in his own singing with Catullus (and Canidia).[34]

Horace's lyre continues its allusive double-speak with the exemplum of the twins Castor and Pollux (42–44). These two gods struck Stesichorus blind for verbally abusing their sister Helen (*infamis Helenae*), but restored his sight after he retracted his libel in another poem. In terms of Horace's argument, it appears that he is simply completing his epic list (8–18) of those who gave up their anger once restitution was made, but a vital detail is changed. In the typical account of Stesichorus' *Palinode*, it is Helen, not her brothers, who blinds and restores his sight (Pl. *Phdr*. 243a, *R*. 586c; Isoc. *Hel*. 64; Aristid. *Or*. 45.54; Dio. Chrys. *Or*. xi. 40–41).[35] The story, as Horace relates it, expands the sphere of vengeance

---

[34] I agree with Putnam among others (2006: 85–87, 153 n.15–16; K.-H., 1884/1958: ad loc.; Fraenkel, 1957: 65; Oliensis, 1991: 115–116; Porter, 1995: 127; Lowrie, 2009b: 109) that *pudica et proba* marks the Catullus in Horace (more skeptical are Lindo, 1969: 176, and Mankin, 1995: ad loc.). Putnam also associates Horace's *perambulabis* (41) with Catullus' invective against Mamurra (*perambulabit omnium cubilia*, 29.7). This adds injury to insult for Canidia, if an audience hears *omnium cubilia* behind *astra*. Putnam (85) is more persuasive when he insists that Catullus 42, together with the story of Stesichorus recanting his invective against Helen, serves as the background for Horace's *C*. I.16 (see also Hahn, 1939: 213–220; Lindo, 1969: 176–177). I would argue that the end of Catullus 42 mediates between epode 17 and *C*. I.16: Horace imports Catullus' false praise into epode 17, but in c.16 he reverses Catullus' sarcasm to orchestrate a modulation between the iambic and lyric modes (*nunc ego mitibus / mutare quaero tristia, dum mihi / fias recantatis amica / opprobriis animumque reddas*, 16.25b–28; compare Horace's use and placement of *modum / pones iambis*, 16.2–3, … *mutare* … *reddas*, 16.26–28, with Catullus' *redde codicillos* … *mutandast ratio modusque vobis*, c.42.22–24; Putnam, 2006: 74–75, 82–86). Horace coined *recanto*, and so we should not read quickly past the prefix (re/cantation; see Chapter 5 on *C*. I.16).

[35] Three Horatian poems are in the form of a recantation / palinode (epode 17; *C*. I.16; 34), although c.34 is of a very different tone; on the structure of palinodes, see Cairns, 1978: 546–552. Plato's passive hides who blinded Stesichorus (τῶν γὰϱ ὀμμάτων στεϱηθεὶς διὰ τὴν Ἑλένης κακηγοϱίαν, *Phdr*. 243a5), but Helen is implied: his anecdote nowhere mentions Helen's brothers and makes a point that Stesichorus was aware enough about poetry and its propensity for error to know what caused the blindness (ἅτε μουσικὸς ὢν ἔγνω τὴν αἰτίαν), namely he had angered Helen. Isocrates specifically states Helen blinded the poet. For various accounts of the *Palinode*, see fr. 32 *PLG*[4]: 3.214–219; 192 *PMG*: 104–105; Vürtheim, 1919; Davies, 1982: 7–16; Gentili, 1988: 126–127, 274–275; Sider, 1989: 423–431. On whether Stesichorus wrote one or two *Palinode/s* (*Ox. Pap*. 2506, fr. 26, col. 1; Stes. fr. 15 and 16: 192 and 193 *PMG*: 106), see Bowra, 1963: 245–252 and N.-H., 1970: 202 [two]; Woodbury, 1967: 157–176 [one]. The existence of a second *Palinode* depends on how far we trust the biographical details in the writings of the

by making Castor and Pollux avengers of an innocent, like the iambist in epode 6, while at the same time the shift allows Horace to avoid acknowledging that his Helen (Canidia) is a strong woman. Nor is Horace's Helen/Canidia necessarily innocent. Whether Helen resisted Paris and was carried off or ran off with him was a well-worn topic.[36] Horace's *infamis* (v.42) works both sides of Helen's reputation, since it means either "disgraced" or "disreputable." Horace's lyre is an obvious liar, and its invective hits harder because it delivers conflicted praise with a matter-of-fact boldness, like a "straight-man" would set up a comic, as though Canidia, like Catullus' adulteress, would not see the punch-line coming.

As the lyre sounds the end of Canidia's praises, it repeats in the negative (45–52) charges previously made against her. She is (not) low-born; she does (not) have experience in scattering ashes where the poor are buried—obvious lies—

> ut haec trementi questus ore constitit
>   insignibus raptis puer,
> impube corpus, quale posset impia
>   mollire Thracum pectora,
> Canidia ... (epode 5.11–15a)

> With trembling lip and stripped of his noble insignia, the boy ended his plaint—a youthful build such as would soften the impious hearts of Thracians—then Canidia ...

> hoc miserae plebi stabat commune sepulchrum,

> ... has nullo perdere possum
> nec prohibere modo, simul ac vaga Luna decorum
> protulit os, quin ossa legant herbasque nocentis. (*S.* I.8.10, 20b–22)

> Here there was established a common burial place for the poor,

> I do not have the power to defy these witches or in any way to stop them, as soon as the traveling moon has shown her beautiful face, from picking up bones and herbs that harm.

---

peripatetic Chamaeleon of Heraclea, mostly conveyed second-hand via Athenaeus (e.g., Athen. 14.620c). Horace was less blind than we are, since he speaks as if he knew Stesichorus' poems first-hand and not in fragments (*C.* IV.9.5–12). For instance, it is probable, but speculative given what little remains of Stesichorus, that Catullus' *mutandast ratio modusque vobis* (42.22) and therefore indirectly Horace's *tu pudica, tu proba* (17.40) both reflect Stesichorus' μέτειμι δὲ ἐφ' ἕτερον προοίμιον, a possible fragment or paraphrase from the *Palinode* (Aristid. *Or.* 33.2; *PLG*^{4}: 3.223).

[36] For a review of Helen's reputation within the context of Stesichorus' *Palinode*, see Woodbury, 1967: 166–168.

The "liar" presses on. Canidia has a son, Pactumeius, and she, his mother, had the strength to jump immediately to her feet after childbirth:[37]

> tibi hospitale pectus et purae manus
> tuusque venter Pactumeius et tuo
> cruore rubros obstetrix pannos lavit,
> utcumque fortis exsilis puerpera. (epode 17.49–52)
>
> You have a welcoming heart and pure hands, and Pactumeius was in your womb and the midwife washed out the cloths red with your blood, however strong you leap up after your labor.

This final praise from the "lyre" would strip Canidia of her witchery by treating her claim to be a mother as legitimate. Witches, reputed baby-snatchers,[38] were seen as persons antithetical to motherhood (cf. the boy's dubious prayer to Canidia as a mother in epode 5.5–6: "if ever Lucina answered your prayer and attended as you gave birth"). Horace pronounces Canidia's heart "welcoming" and her hands "pure" (D. Mankin, 1995: 285, compares epode 5.13–14, 59–60) and for good measure throws into the account as chief witness the midwife who assisted the witch in giving birth, although midwives were rumored to aid in absconding with other mothers' children.[39] The sarcasm dripping from

[37] Hahn (1939: 218–220) rehearses in full the possible connections between epodes 5 and 17. Whether this witch has children becomes tangled up, as Hahn illustrates, in the question of whether Canidia is a real person (see epode 5, Chapter 2). I will reaffirm my agnosticism on the matter in spite of Orelli's "Atque *Pactumeius* re vera nomen est Romanum" (1837: nn. 49–52, citing P. Pactumeius, Q. Pactumeius Fronto, Pactumeius Clemens, T. Pactumeius Magnus). Actual names in poems do not always represent historic persons. D' Arms (1967: 141–145) points out that the name Pactumeius is Campanian and that Horace is likely representing Canidia as being from that general area (epode 5.41–44), but he stops short of saying that either witch or son are real. Conversely, just because names are etymologically useful (Watson, 2003: 569: "The middle element of Pactumeius [tumere, 'swell'] also sounds suspiciously like a pun on *venter*, the belly of an expectant mother.") does not mean that they could not represent historic persons (e.g., M. Valerius Messala Corvinus, "wine-heart," in Horace's hymn to a wine-jar, *descende, Corvino iubente / promere languidiora vina*, *C.* III.21.7–8).

[38] See epode 5, Chapter 2.

[39] N.b. Watson's review of the evidence (2003: 568–570, nn. 50–52, 51), which includes severe penalties imposed on midwives guilty of *suppositio partus* (Antiph. fr. 159 Kock; Ter. *And.* 228–233; Sor. *Gyn.* 1.1.3, 1.2.4; Paul. *Sent.* 2.24.9); on the presumed link between midwives and witches, n.b. Harley, 1990: 1–26. For the duties of the midwife and their practices, see French, 1986: 69–84. *Obstetrices* were open to accusations of sorcery, since they used spells and other witch-like charms; but, as a practical matter they had more access at the birth and so opportunity for foul play. It stands to reason that "befriending" a midwife would be one of the more direct ways to procure an infant.

Horace's lyre asserts that Canidia, the mother of a child rightly her own, does not fit the stereotype for her character.[40] The lyre, unlike epic and elegy, pins Canidia into a corner. If Canidia accepts the praise of the lying lyre that she is upright, true, that she strides among the stars, and that she is a mother, then she is at odds with her own *persona* and must forfeit her magical mystique. If Canidia calls the lyre on its lies, then she will have to confess her true and foul nature, which includes the abduction of children. Horace's lyre has some power to hem in Canidia.[41]

If Canidia were a lesser antagonist, Horace's lyre-liar might have caught her off-guard, but she makes a learned response. She does not accept Horace's recapitulation at face value, as if he were "groveling"?[42] As far as Canidia is concerned, his surrender lasts too long and attempts too much. She treats it as a challenge rather than a palinode, which might prompt her to issue a reprieve. Her first words communicate her impatience with Horace's speech: "Why do you pour out these prayers, when my ears are locked tight?" (*'Quid obseratis auribus fundis preces?,'* 53). Before she lists the punishments she has in mind for Horace, she threatens that his doom will move more slowly than his vows. Since he went on so long with his argument, it will cost him more pain (*'sed tardiora fata te votis manent.,'* 62).[43] In general, Canidia's vehemence shows she recognizes that Horace's surrender is plenty spirited. He deserves reprisal. The witch, true to her temperament, answers back hard.

If Horace can co-opt Canidia's magic, she can reuse his *carmina*. Canidia's counter-attack proves she is an attentive and smart interpreter of Horatian song. She formulates her curse by refashioning and then sending back against Horace his own iambic, sprinkling into her retort enough details from his previous iambics to let him know that she has been listening as he has tried to alter the cycle of rage/revenge. Canidia sings back to Horace. She will be deafer than the cliffs Neptune

[40] The overbearing repetition of the possessives at the beginning and end of lines (*tibi … tuusque … et tuo*, 49–50) replicates Canidia's insistent protests that the child is hers. The intense sarcasm suggests that *utcumque* calls attention to the extremes in Canidia's pretense (*utcumque*, "however strong it may be you leap up") more than that she regularly committed *suppositio partus* (*utcumque*, "whenever"); cf. Watson, 2003: 570, n. 52; Porph. ad v.50: *cum per ironiam et haec dicantur, vult intellegi illam Pactumeiu⟨m⟩, qui filius eius existimabatur, subpossuisse sibi, non peperisse.*

[41] Compare Lowrie, 2009b: 109–111.

[42] Oliensis' "groveling surrender" (1998: 102) captures what she sees as the *Epodes*' pessimistic conclusion, compared to the triumphant ending of *Odes* III.

[43] Curses often invoke endless suffering; see Watson, 1991: 35–38.

strikes with the deep sea (17.53–55, cp. against Maevius, epode 10.15–18: *o quantus instat navitis sudor tuis / tibique … / preces et aversum ad Iovem*). It will do no good to bribe old Paelignian sorceresses or to mix a more potent poison (17.60–61, cp. the gifts that Horace's old woman used to bribe him, epode 12.1–3, 21–24; Canidia's own promise to brew a stronger potion for Varus, epode 5.73–82).[44] Nothing will free Horace from retribution (17.69–73), not the laws of Jove (cp. epode 5.87–88), not self-inflicted wounds suffered either by plunging from high battlements or by thrusting a Noric sword through the chest (cp. epode 1.1–2; 7.1–2). Canidia is reversing Horace's iambic against Rome's propensity for civil violence and turning it against the iambist with a jaded twist. If she has her way, there will be worse things for Horace than death by his own hand. The Lykambids had it easy. Neither will the lyre allow him any relief. Canidia reminds him of this by transforming the lyric advice the noble centaur Chiron gave his ward Achilles to alleviate his cares with wine and song (*'illic omne malum vino cantuque levato / deformis aegrimoniae, dulcibus alloquiis.*,' epode 13.17–18) into her own terse description for the abject condition Horace will endure, when he fails to gain relief through suicide (*fastidiosa tristis aegrimonia*, 17.73).[45] Canidia, for her part, predicts that she in fact will become the victorious knight (epode 16), scattering Roman bones, riding this time on the iambist's back like the shade of the cursing boy, who vowed to crouch like a Fury on Canidia's chest (epode 5):

[44] An ambiguity (v.60) causes S.B. to print "proderat" [(σχ) (B)] over the majority reading *proderit* [a C Ψ P[l]]. With *proderit* we can understand either "mihi" (Canidia) or "tibi" (Horace); see Porph. ad loc.; Mankin, 1995: 289, n. 60–61. If "tibi," then Canidia tells Horace that it will do him no good to seek out other witches or to consider poisoning himself to avoid any prolonged suffering. If Canidia is speaking of herself ("mihi"), most likely she complains sarcastically that her powers are next to useless, if Horace mocks her with impunity. She then rants on that Horace is not going to get away with anything, because slow painful fates await him. "Proderat" eliminates the ambiguity, since Canidia would be reaffirming her previous statement about her need for a stronger potion against Varus in epode 5, and therefore would be speaking of herself ("mihi"). It also necessitates that a conditional relationship somehow be understood between Canidia's two questions (59–60): (If) "you thought you could defame me throughout the city? … what good did it do me to mix stronger poisons?" This is possible but uncertain. Porphyrio preferred "tibi," and I would add in its favor: (1) "tibi" does not break from Canidia's second address to Horace so that she says aloud what she thinks to herself; (2) with "tibi" Canidia places Horace in the weaker position that she once experienced (but now does not) of needing a stronger spell. It would not be in Canidia's interest against her present antagonist to bring up her former weakness without denying it for herself and transferring it to him.

[45] Horace uses the uncommon *aegrimonia* in these two instances only.

vectabor umeris tunc ego inimicis eques
meaeque terra cedet insolentiae[46] (epode 17.74–75)

I, then, a horseman, will ride on your hateful shoulders and the land will fall to my unrivaled arrogance.

barbarus, heu, cineres insistet victor et urbem
eques sonante verberabit ungula
quaeque carent ventis et solibus ossa Quirini
(nefas videre!) dissipabit insolens. (epode 16.11–14)

A conquering foreigner, it pains me to say, will stand on her ashes and the horseman, hooves thundering, will beat the city flat, and—an unspeakable sight—Quirinus' bones, kept safe before from the wind and rain, he in arrogance will scatter.

petamque vultus umbra curvis unguibus,
quae vis deorum est Manium,
et inquietis adsidens praecordiis
pavore somnos auferam. (epode 5.93–96)

And I, a shade, will rip at your face with my curved claws, which is the strength given to the divine Manes, and sitting on your uneasy breast I will replace sleep with the shivers.

So much gives away Canidia's attentive eavesdropping, but the witch lets Horace in on one more little secret by recalling the scene in *S.* I.8, when the satirist saw her and Sagana working their magic with images of wax and wool in the Esquiline cemetery (I.8.23–45): "Or should I, who can make waxen images live, as you, you busybody, know . . ." (epode 17.76–77). Horace thought he was spying on Canidia in secret (*S.* I.8); she knows he was there watching. Horace was a witch-voyeur. And on this occasion Canidia informs him in no uncertain terms that she did not take well the joke made at her expense, the scary Priapean fart that made her scurry away and turned her into a public spectacle:

inultus ut tu riseris Cotytia
vulgata, sacrum liberi Cupidinis,
et Esquilini pontifex venefici
impune ut urbem nomine impleris meo? (epode 17.56–59)

[46] S.B. prints Campbell's "turba" (1945: ad loc.) for *terra*. I disagree. *Terra* fits better the interplay of epode 17 with 16, which depicts the horseman violating the land.

To think that you would laugh unavenged at your prostituting of the Cotytian rites, the ritual of unbridled Cupid, and that you, you priest of Esquiline sorcery, with no repercussions at all would stuff the city with your stories about me?

nam displosa sonat quantum vesica pepedi
diffissa nate ficus. at illae currere in urbem.
Canidiae dentis, altum Saganae caliendrum
excidere atque herbas atque incantata lacertis
vincula cum magno risuque iocoque videres. (*S.* I.8.46–50)

Then as loud as exploding guts, I farted and my fig-wood ass cracked. But they high-tailed it to the city. You could see Canidia's teeth and Sagana's tall wig losing their grip, and the herbs and charmed cords dropping from their arms—a colossal laugh and joke.

Canidia will not be chased off with a laugh. This time around she affirms the iambist's worse fears as he watched the witches bury and starve the Roman noble boy (epode 5). Witches can grab the moon down from the sky and are prepared to mix more powerful potions (epode 17.77–81; cp. 5.45–46, 77–82). Canidia comes back angry and angrier—it is no wonder, since Horace now has unmasked himself as the author of *Satire* I.8 and in effect revealed himself as the 'gas-bag' Priapus who succeeded in scaring her off.

Canidia's half of the duet is a highly acute, re/cantation of Horace's own verbal acts against her, which means that Horace's primary interlocutor and most sophisticated listener, while he has been pushing iambic beyond the rage-revenge paradigm, has been none other than the witchy Canidia.[47] She has heard it all. The boy buried up to his neck used his dying words to curse her ('*diris agam vos*', epode 5.89a). The poet followed up with an attacking iamb ending with the question, "When some black-tooth attacks me, will I unavenged cry like a boy?" (*an, si quis atro dente me petiverit, / inultus ut flebo puer?*, epode 6.15–16). It is Canidia's turn to exact from the iambist what she considers her own redress.[48] The last words of the *Epodes* belong to her, and she answers back with the same tone of defiance that completes her question, "Should I, who can

[47] Compare Canidia, the audience of iambic, to Davus, the audience of satire ("*Iamdudum ausculto et cupiens tibi dicere servus / pauca reformido*," *S.* II.7.1–2a).

[48] Canidia, the clever audience that she is, does not distinguish Horace the satirist from Horace the iambist, She is able easily to carry an argument over from one collection to the next. We, on the other hand, often prefer to operate by individual poems or at the most within the bounds of separate collections (see the Introduction).

make waxen images live, as you, you busybody, know . . ." (76–77)—"Should I cry over the results of my skill, accomplishing nothing at all against you?" ('*plorem artis in te* ***nil agentis*** *exitus?*', 81). By Canidia's definition, iambic revenge (*agentia verba*) is always in season, whether it is turn-about-fair-play or she is the one who started it all. Does it matter, when all is said and done, who hit whom first? The iambist's job is to strike.

From that narrow Lykambid perspective, personified in Canidia, the *Epodes*, "poised on the brink of Actium" (Oliensis, 1998: 64; Barchiesi, 2001: 141; 2002: 50, 65) is frightening territory. Common pressures and threats, which a Roman citizen such as Horace might face, parade their destabilizing potential. Among their towering ships fight powerful patrons, summoning to battle and wondering what their friends can do for them (epode 1). There is no escaping from *negotium*, garlic mixed in with the banquet fare (epodes 2–3). Upstart slaves assume new positions of power and those who have overreached their station must beware what others think of them (epodes 4, 6). Boys, buried up to their necks, die, becoming men and cursing their enemies (epode 5). The country with its social foundations in jeopardy is at war against itself (epodes 7, 16.1–14). Frustration turns to madness: cursing incompetence (epode 10) and charges of impotency (epodes 8, 12). Canidia has a song of spite to sing (epode 17.53–81) and she, unlike Horace, insists on only one iambic chord, the one stalking to death Lykambes: Horace = *non res et agentia verba Lycamben*; Canidia = '*plorem artis in te nihil agentis exitus?*'

Horace, however, finds another way to talk iambic—more in tune with its ritual conceptualization—without being weak. Horatian iambic forges responsions, including with Canidia. Horace's constant shuffling of competing characters and literary themes, as well as the beginning strains of his lyric, which induce Canidia to sing back to him, all blend skillfully together (fusion), educating his wider audience, those beyond Canidia, about wanting more out of iambic (their social discourse) than words that hunt down Lykambes. Throughout this chapter I have tagged Alessandro Barchiesi's (2009: 232–246) helpful paradigm for reading epode 17, "reversibility." Horace's duet with Canidia constantly turns back on Canidia and Horace himself, so that it becomes a conflation of aggression / repression, praise / blame. Barchiesi, therefore, raises the question whether Horace can claim any superiority over Canidia, if he too slanders her with his own incantation. My answer is that by giving Canidia voice and entering into an exchange with her, Horace succeeds

in representing his magical iambic as a dialogic mode, multiplex rather than monolithic. By transgressing into Canidia's territory, listening to her and singing with her, he differentiates his iambic from hers. He exposes the self-destructive tendency in the Archilochean-Lykambid tradition as political discourse and defines as "soft" those staying on their couches to live in a Rome infested with wolves (epode 16). He appropriates Candia's spell-making and assigns her the last words she will ever speak, but not before he cheats her by awakening a desire for something more sophisticated and complex than the madness (*furor*) in her singular approach to invective.

On the one hand, perhaps Canidia's view of iambic, verbal rage meant to punish and dominate, is as persuasive as it is because of our own experience. We have seen in "wars" past and present that such invective proves an effective weapon, especially in manipulating public opinion against the newest outsider or the most recent unjust cause, whether it be "faithless" Lykambes, or "effeminate," "anti-republican" Antony, or a "far-right" / "far-left" politician. On the other hand, our reaction to the conclusion of the *Epodes* proves the efficacy of Horace's iambic. Epode 17 ends abruptly for us precisely because we so very much want Horace to talk back to Canidia one more time. Just as when we are watching a contemporary comic satirist / iambist perform, we are not ready for the Horace-Canidia duet, their "wrestling match" (*luctor*; συμπλοκή), to end, and it seems we are on the verge of shouting out with Horace: "That position you have is unfair, and I demand a change" (*Epist.* I.19.47). When Horace does not instantly answer, we think him pessimistic and hope that his "submission" shows the ugliness of *Canidia insolens*. Nonetheless, the hint of power in his lyre (. . . *lyra / voles sonari*, epode 17.39–40a) points to another compelling possibility. Horace's reply comes in the form of his lyrics. He leaves us wanting this transition, his iambic-lyric re/cantation, which he will sing through the beginning half of *Odes* I (Chapter 5).

In the meantime, Horace's iambic has already shown its spirit, since our discontent that the duet seems over betrays that he has elicited from us an appreciation for his own brand of iambic *polyeideia*. Canidia has become a "scapegoat" of Horace's own making.[49] She still embodies the blackness and crime from which Roman society must be purged (the compulsion for vengeance and the willingness to feed off of each

[49] Canidia's qualifications as a *pharmakos* and the efficacy of Horace's iambic aesthetic are discussed in the Introduction.

other), but Horace also seduces even her (and us) into listening to his iambic *carmen* and making song with him. In the process of our listening to Horace's generic variety and understanding how it interacts with expressions of rage, we have begun in the course of the *Epodes* (*ibis* ... *exitus*, 1.1 / 17.81) to discount an iambic that sings at / against you in favour of formulating song with you (μέθεξις).

CHAPTER FIVE

HORACE'S IAMBIC TO LYRIC RE/CANTATION (*C.* I.1; 5; 13–17)

> Audiences of literature, who delight in transforming writers into intimate acquaintances, tend to be hurt when their poets (their pets, their personal property) begin to behave eccentrically. Horace the suave satirist had utterly disappeared—or so it seemed—to be replaced by an arrogant, affected stranger. (The satirist, of course, had not vanished, but it would take considerable patience and experience to recover him in the bewildering novelty of his new styles and sounds.)
> (W.R. Johnson, 1982: 129)

Horace does not leave readers, who are trying to "recover him," to their own devices. He references his moves between books and poetic types: *C.* I.1 replays the priamel of *S.* I.1; his return to lyric (*non sum qualis eram*, *C.* IV.I.3a) picks up the argument of his resignation (*non eadem est aetas, non mens*, *Epist.* I.1.2b–10); *C.* IV.1.5 names by title *C.* I.19, *mater saeva Cupidinum*; images of poetic immortality connect *C.* I.1, II.20, III.30, and IV.3. Through such markers Horace invites his audience to read his transitions into a whole and adjust expectations, using what they know, for example, of his iambic to test his lyric.[1] What will be discovered is that, while mockery does not disappear (the subject for the next chapter), Horace's iambic criticism, consonance over domination, comes to full fruition in the *Odes*. Horace's lyric, therefore, grows out of his iambic praxis.

Horace will complete throughout the first half of *Odes* I the palinode he began in epode 17, that is, how his lyre continues moving away from the monolithic retaliatory rage represented by the Lykambid tradition sums up his full appraisal of iambic and gives definition to what will

[1] See the Introduction; also Johnson (2004b: 5–6); Harrison's forthcoming chapter, "There and Back Again: Horace's Poetic Career."

prove to be the essence of his iambic-lyric praxis.[2] When Horace gives a formalistic description of his lyric, the linking together of words and musical notes (*verba loquor socianda chordis*, *C.* IV.9.4), he personifies the harmonizing ("socializing") of unequal elements: words and notes become allies.[3] He then follows up this definition of lyric with his fullest listing of the so-called Greek lyric canon (*C.* IV.9.5–12); only Ibycus and Alcman are left out.[4] As testimony to his lyric diversity, Horace does not just aim to be added to this specific and closed group (*C.* I.1 *infra*), he places at the head of his listing in *C.* IV.9 none other than Homer

---

[2] While work on individual odes piles up, we move farther away from any meaningful consensus on the general nature of Horace's lyric beyond its attempt at a formalistic simulation of its Greek counterpart. Barchiesi in his abstract (2006; subsequently published in Harrison, 2007: 144–161, n.b. 144–153) opens for debate whether "genre" can rightly be applied to Roman lyric: "… an attempt to summarize some of the most recurring problems about Horace and the genre of Roman lyric (if indeed there was a genre)." Compare Davis' attempt (2010: 105–127) to define a lyric ethos.

[3] "Personifies" is not exaggerated. Compare the "negotiated" settlement that admits the spondee into the iambic trimeter (*tardior ut paulo graviorque veniret ad auris, / spondeos stabilis in iura paterna recepit / commodus et patiens, non ut de sede secunda / cederet aut quarta socialiter*, *Ars* 255–258b). The verb (*sociare*) appears in Horace only at *C.* IV.9.4, but his consistent use of the related adjective and substantive ("allied, allies": *S.* II.5.72; *C.* I.7.26; III.24.60; *Epist.* I.2.21; II.1.122, 142) justifies treating *socio* as more than a convenient synonym for *iungo*. See Ov. *Met.* 11.4–5: the Maenads succeeded in murdering Orpheus only after they had drowned out with their assault the sound of his "civilizing" lyre (… *cernunt / Orphea percussis sociantem carmina nervis*). The translation of these instances in Horace and Ovid as "to be accompanied by" bypasses the connotation the word acquires in common usage, indispensable within both contexts. This "socializing" dynamic within Horace's song is why I use musical terms (resolution; consonance) that can also describe socio-political discourse (see the Introduction).

[4] Eidinow (2010: 80 n.1) reminds that, although the list was set, "canon" was a modern designation. *Ceae* (IV.9.7) also references Simonides' nephew, Bacchylides. Horace's objective to be added to the select list of lyricists at the outset of the *Odes* is beyond bold in its claim to originality (Feeney, 1993: 41; Barchiesi, 2006: 3; 2007: 146–149, "Lyric form: models, meter, collection;" Eidinow, 2010: 83). Horace, by naming his vocation and his chosen rivals *lyrici vates*, unites disparate times and cultures. Vergil brought the archaic *vates* into contemporary parlance as the sanctioned designation for Augustan poet (*Ecl.* 7.28; 9.34). When Horace ventured the *Odes*, there were no Roman *lyrici*. Λυρικοί were Greek, and Cicero did not even bother translating the term (*qui λυρικοί a Graecis nominantur*, Cic. *Or.* 183). By this *callida iunctura* (Newman, 1967:130), *lyrici vates*, Horace confronts Greek exclusivity and pries open the Greek lyric canon by designating lyric a multicultural phenomenon. His lyric is simultaneously old and new, Greek and Roman, and therefore neither one nor the other but an original expression. Nothing fires up Horace's anger more than tag-alongs claiming to be poets, although they are nothing more than slavish mimics. He will not be one. Horace, the ultra-Callimachean, does not just walk on an unworn or narrow path (Call. *Aetia* fr. 1.25–28 Pf.). He walks into a transcultural and metatemporal experience, where no one has set foot before (*Epist.* I.19.21–33a).

(... *si priores Maeonius tenet / sedes Homerus*, 5–6a). Horace goes further and adds in the epic Vergil, when he closes out the *Odes* and his last banquet-song with a lyric rendition of the *Aeneid* (*Lydis remixto carmine tibiis / Troiamque et Anchisen et almae / progeniem Veneris canemus.*, *C.* IV.15.30–32). To make his point, he labels this final banquet song an intermingling, a "remixed song" (*remixto carmine*, 15.30; cf. *Me doctarum hederae praemia frontium / dis miscent superis*, *C.* I.1.29–30a) and rewrites Vergil's singular *cano* into the plural *canemus*. Horace's lyric (its structures, musicality, and performance) revels in pluralism, and therefore his song as a whole is overtly *politic* in that it centers its value on a negotiated sense of community, both literary and actual, over against singular domination.[5] In other words, "Listen, Canidia, to an—

Overture to Re/cantation: Acts of Resolution (C. I.1; 5; 13–15)"

Lyric Attraction (C. I.1)

Have you ever shared a book, good or bad, with friends and waited to see their expression when they began reading? Or have you ever watched other library patrons perusing the shelves? Calvus and Catullus knew the game:

di magni, horribilem et sacrum libellum!
quem tu scilicet ad tuum Catullum
misti, continuo ut die periret
Saturnalibus, optimo dierum!
non non hoc tibi, salse, sic abibit:
nam si luxerit, ad librariorum
curram scrinia; Caesios, Aquinos,
Suffenum, omnia colligam venena,
ac te his suppliciis remunerabor. (Cat. 14.12–20)

Great gods, what an uncouth and vile little book! And you, I am sure, sent it to your friend Catullus to murder him on the spot and that on

[5] Horace inherits the communal nature of his lyric as a matter of course from the performance-culture of archaic Greek lyric; see Heinze's "Die Horazische Ode" (1923: 172–189), arguably the most important work on the character of Horatian lyric. We should guard against transposing into "community, communal" a egalitarian sense from modern political contexts. Horace's lyric, as sympotic or convivial, unites the divergent, and therefore becomes entangled in expressing the social dynamics between the various strata of Roman society. In his songs, Horace is preoccupied with the relationship of inferior to superior (Johnson, 2004b: xiii–xx, 3–26; Barchiesi, 2006: 16–17; 2007: 159–160, "The symposion").

> the Saturnalia, the best of days. No, prankster, this will not end the way you think. For as soon as it's light, I'll run to the book-sellers' shelves. I'll gather up the Caesii, Aquinii, Suffenus, all the poisons, and with these punishments I'll pay you back.

Go ahead, pass out copies of Horace's *Odes*, especially to those who would know only the *Sermones* and *Iambi*. Readers do not know quite what to think about the first ode. Their reactions fascinate. Judgments vary widely. It is hard to see why some, Professor Fraenkel for one, bothered to read on: "In the greater part of the ode (c.1) Horace does not say anything especially original (1957: 232)."[6]

Although it may be convenient to defend Horace's opening lyric and its success as a proem by looking ahead and matching it with what we learn about his lyric themes from the remainder of the *Odes*, it would be a more authentic experience not to "play the music backwards" but to look back to the Horace his audience would already know best, the satirist and iambist.[7] There are, as in all fine music, variation and repetition. From his first *carmen* (cantation) we are in different literary territory than anything he authored before—the lesser Asclepiadean meter along with the Olympic dust on the chariots (3), the Muses, Euterpe and Polyhymnia, and the Lesbian lyre, (33–34) all signal a shift to a fresh

[6] Fraenkel's *Horace*, for all its brilliance, often presents too ready a target. One could also cite Quinn (1980: 117): "a relaxed, discursive epistle;" Campbell (1924: 228): "II. xiii. is more interesting than most of these [odes on Horace's aspirations]." La Penna (1969: 176) is less than complimentary; compare N.-H. (1970: 2–3): "Not only the content but also the form of our ode is traditional … Horace's overture is very simple in structure and metre, but it does not lack unpretentious artistry." All appear in a hurry to dispense with the formal rotation of the priamel so that they can concentrate on the ode's final eight verses, Horace's bold claim for lyric immortality (cf. Commager, 1962: 330–331; Feeney, 1993: 41; Lyne, 1995: 68–71; exceptions being Cody, 1976: 48–71; Dunn, 1989: 97–109; Sutherland, 2002: 20–32). Those commending the ode do so for its language and rhythm (Wilkinson, 1945: 137; Schönberger, 1966: 409–411; Williams, 1968: 756; Connor, 1987: 40–41), potential for irony (Schönberger, 1966: 388–389 n.3; Syndikus, 1972: 29–32; West, 1995: 5–6), emphasis on poetic inspiration (Dunn, 1989: 100–109), and in general the diversity of its themes that set the tone for the rest of the lyrics (Vretska, 1971: 323–335; Porter, 1987: 18–19).

[7] Fraenkel (1957: 230), following the supposed order of composition that privileges the author Horace's perspective over the reader's, views the poem in a retrospective manner, as do most: "… a poet will hardly compose a proem until his work is near its completion … It is therefore not unlikely that most of the passages in this ode which remind us of passages in the other odes are in fact deliberate echoes or variations of them …". I agree, but wonder what impression the lyric must have made on an audience not concerned with how the *Odes* were put together until more of them had been experienced. On the other hand, Horace's audience could hardly assume a "naive" stance (Pomeroy's term for accepting c.1 on its own merits, 1980: 36–37) after his *Satires* and *Epodes*.

poetic mode. Horace in c.1 has also stopped preaching (the *Satires* everywhere), cursing (the *Epodes* frequently), and talking with a witch (epode 17). He is instead prepared to rival the greatest of the Greek lyricists, and, at his patron's nod, to join the gods among the stars (*sublimi feriam sidera vertice*, 36 last line). These changes communicate effectively that he will keep on indulging his taste for innovation and perfection, Horace the original Roman lyricist.[8] The lyre does not play, however, a totally unfamiliar tune. In the first poems of the *Satires*, *Epodes*, and *Odes*, Horace works through three variations on a theme, *nemo contentus* (*mempsimoiria*). Each literary mode has its own unique sound that adds to the whole: the satirist, "Everyone envies the position another has. Then, if a god appears and allows them to take the other's place, they refuse" (s. 1.1–22); the iambist, "You are going to war, Maecenas, and I am willing to follow you. Be sure though that you know I am content with where I am and what I have. It is more than enough" (epode 1.23–34); the lyricist, "Everyone has their occupation that they cannot give up, and so do I. In fact, mine is the best" (c. 1).[9]

Horace creates in his third variation (the lyric mode) the most inviting dissonance in the theme by introducing in the priamel a figure who, unlike the other listed professions, is from all appearances *aliquis contentus* (1.19–22):

est qui nec veteris pocula Massici
nec partem solido demere de die
spernit, nunc viridi membra sub arbuto
stratus, nunc ad aquae lene caput sacrae;

There is one who does not turn down cups of aged Massic, nor refuse to subtract part from the day's total, now stretching out his limbs under the lush berry tree, now at the gentle head of a sacred stream.

---

[8] Horace insists that a, if not the, primary feature of his legacy is originality (*euhoe!* ***recenti*** *mens trepidat metu*, *C.* II.19.5; ***Odi profanum vulgus*** *et arceo./favete linguis*: ***carmina non prius/audita*** *Musarum sacerdos/virginibus puerisque canto*, *C.* III.1.1–4; *dicam insigne*, ***recens***, *adhuc*/***indictum ore alio***, *C.* III.25.7–8a; … *potens*/***princeps Aeolium carmen*** *ad Italos/deduxisse modos*, *C.* III.30.12–14a; … *posui vestigia* ***princeps***,/*non aliena meo pressi pede … Parios ego primus iambos/ostendi Latio … hunc quoque*, ***non alio dictum prius ore***, *Latinus*/***vulgavi*** *fidicen*, *Epist.* I.19.21–33a; *fingent* ***Aeolio carmine nobilem***, *C.* IV.3.12; *Ne forte credas interitura quae/longe sonantem natus ad Aufidum/non* ***ante vulgatas per artis***/*verba loquor socianda chordis*, *C.* IV.9.1–4). Horace does not bother varying his language much in making the point.

[9] The interplay of c.1 with s.1 receives more notice (cf. Musurillo, 1962: 231–233; Shey, 1971: 190–193; Gold, 1992: 175–185) than c.1 with epode 1.

Is this lounging "someone" (*est qui*) a positive, or at least enviable, figure or not? One could say, "No." The wine-drinker makes "shirking" a virtue (*nec partem solido demere de die / spernit = otium*), compared to all the other examples of Roman industry (the charioteer, politician, grain-dealer, farmer, merchant, soldier, hunter). He functions in the priamel as a foil, listed between the merchant and soldier, which implies that the poet rejects to some degree this person's choice for life along with all the others. Nonetheless, it would be an understandable response for those familiar with the *Epodes* to admire the wine-drinker and want to be him.[10] The scenery the wine-drinker enjoys sounds remarkably similar to Alfius' imagined idyllic countryside (epode 2.19–25, at virtually the same point in each poem):[11]

ut gaudet insitiva decerpens pira
  certantem et uvam purpurae,
qua muneretur te, Priape, et te, pater
  Silvane, tutor finium!

---

[10] For the definition and examples of the priamel-form, see Bundy (1962), Schmid (1964), and Race (1982; 1988). The nameless *est qui* has been called a variety of names, some more congenial than others: "gentleman of leisure" (Commager, 1962: 331; "Genießer," Schönberger, 1966: 397); "hedonist" (Santirocco, 1986: 18); "wealthy prodigal" (Shey, 1971: 185); "*vir beatus*" (Cody, 1976: 63–70); "lazy wine drinker" (Connor, 1987: 42); "l'epicureo" (Ghiselli, 1983: 53); "reclining man" (Dunn, 1989: 99); "idler" (Sutherland, 2002: 28). In a less daring priamel Horace perhaps would make all his listed characters clearly distinguishable from and inferior to the poet. As the priamel stands, it is difficult to decide whether he censures all (West, 1995: 4–5) with the possible exception of the peasant farmer (N.-H., 1970: 1, ad v.11; Sutherland, 2002: 20–29), some (politician, merchant, soldier, hunter) and not others (peasant, *est qui*; Shey, 1971:188; Cody, 1976: 48–52; Dunn, 1989: 106), or none at all (Wickham, 1896: 33; Schönberger, 1966: 388–412). The more closely he is identified with Horace, the more nicely readers tend to treat Mr. *Qui* (*infra*). When the figure of the wine-drinker seems misplaced among the other hard-working occupations, some adjustments must be made. On the more extreme side are Vretska (1971: 335), who rejects the designation "priamel" for c.1 altogether, and Setaioli (1973: 50–59), who argues that Horace has written an inverted priamel moving from the most favored to the least. C.1, however, reads as a straightforward priamel with the sole exception of the wine-drinker. Why abandon the form completely? Setaioli's inverted priamel culminates in debasing the poet, which undermines Horace's jubilant claim to immortality that ends the song. Pomeroy (1980: 43–46) exemplifies a moderate and popular viewpoint, when he characterizes c.1 as a priamel with a bit of a "twist." Horace shares some traits with those he censures, a tendency for both a satirist and iambist (also Maurach, 2001: 161–162); for example, he is no more likely to give up his vocation than the peasant farmer.

[11] The landscapes of epode 2 and c.1 recall the bucolic Vergil (*G.* 2.458–540; *C.* IV.12.9–12; cf. Lucr. 2.29–33), and Horace is apt to be using the scene to imagine his poetics, a combination of the hard and soft (*ilice*; *gramine*, epode 2.23–24) and the grand and playful (*labuntur altis interim ripis aquae*, epode 2.25).

libet iacere modo sub antiqua ilice,
modo in tenaci gramine;
labuntur altis interim ripis aquae, (epode 2.19–25)

How he rejoices in picking grafted pears and the grape laden with purple, which he dedicates to you, Priapus, and you father Silvanus, protector of his borders! He enjoys lying under the old oak and again on the thick grass; all the while the stream slides by within its high banks.

The loan-shark may be easy to despise, but it is also easy to sympathize with his desire to escape. It would seem that the wine-drinker has gone ahead and taken the advice Chiron gave to Achilles (epode 13.17–18): the hero should ease the troubles of his life with wine and song.

Horace to all intents and purposes has restaged in c.1 Alfius' imagined dream-land without any of the frustrated disappointment and bitterness from the *Epodes*. The wine-drinker enjoys his cups of old Massic; he is not troubled by dishes laced with garlic (Maecenas, epode 3) or by magical potions (Canidia, epodes 5 and 17). At the end of his *Epodes*, Horace presented leaving Rome and sailing away to the utopia of the Blessed Isles as a transformative alternative to civil conflict (epode 16), but the drawback to such a vision is that the Blessed Isles offer a surrealistic hope, couched in prophecy. This opening lyric (c.1) changes the imagined and elusive utopia from the *Epodes* into a moment as real as any of the other Roman occupations, while it retains a compelling allure. Could anyone, even the most labor-hardened farmer, sea merchant, or highly-ambitious-but-employed-poet, hear c.1 and not want to join in the sympotic repose, pour some wine, and rest by a river, if only for part of the day?[12]

The life-style of the wine-drinker appeals so universally that a slippage occurs when c.1 is read both backward and forward—back against the *Satires* and *Epodes* and forward against the *Odes*: the lyricist simultaneously rewrites daydream and utopia into reality and then adopts the personality of the most attractive foil he presents (the wine-drinker).

12 Horace introduces the desire for escape, a primary emotion within his priamel, right before *est qui*. The merchant, playing the same role as Alfius, praises the countryside but refuses to break from his business because he cannot face poverty (*mercator metuens otium et oppidi / laudat rura sui, mox reficit rates / quassas, indocilis pauperiem pati*, 16–18). Then, Horace brings *est qui* on stage as a character whom the other workers would envy privately but likely ridicule in public (cf. Connor, 1987: 42). See Cody (1976: 54): Horace centers the catalogue on the contrast between the work-alcoholic merchant and the content wine-drinker. The comparison constitutes a sort of invitation to choose between two life-styles.

The whole sequence is artful seduction, that is, the wine-drinker, his world now a plausible choice not a dream, also captivates the poet, who in the course of the *Odes* emerges as the *magister bibendi*, inviting us to enjoy life's pleasures.[13] The wine-drinker's repose comes to epitomize Horace's sympotic mode: (1) a strong appeal to join in drinking (*veteris pocula Massici*), which is symbolic of the pleasures of the moment; (2) the inevitable passing of time (*partem solido demere de die*); (3) an emphasis on the present moment reinforced by repeated temporal adverbs (*nunc, nunc*). All are standard components in Horace's *carpe diem* invitations.[14] Yet, if the sympotic persona, which figures so prominently in the rest of the *Odes*, is momentarily suppressed, the similarity of the wine-drinker to Horace's own lyric character is still evident from the general description of the pair within c.1. Both enjoy the cool shade and gain refreshment from sacred sources, a spring and the Muses.[15] The garlanded poet mixes (*miscent*) with the gods and the wine-drinker physically unites himself with the god (wine) he ingests. By aligning his persona with that of the wine-drinker, Horace identifies himself with an exceptional, and essentially appealing figure set apart from all other Roman occupations.

---

[13] I agree with those who, although they argue about the degree, associate Horace with the wine-drinker (Collinge, 1961: 109; Musurillo, 1962: 233, 237–238; Reckford, 1969: 15–16; Pasoli, 1971: 427–429; Vretska, 1971: 335; Putnam, 1973: 16–17; Cody, 1976: 54, 63–71; Santirocco, 1986: 17–18; Porter, 1987: 240–243; Dunn, 1989: 97–101; Davis, 1991: 4). Kipling's priamel in his "A Translation" (after "Regulus") updates Horace's Olympic charioteers ("Others the heated wheel extol, / And all its offspring, whose concern / Is how to make it farthest roll / And farthest turn."), and his priamel's conclusion identifies the first person of the poet with a *carpe diem* mind-set in language most reminiscent of *C.* I.9. Kipling's "I" confesses openly to being inspired by Pindar—only Pindar: "Me, much incurious if the hour / Present, or to be paid for, brings / Me to Brundisium by the power / Of wheel or wings; / Me in whose breast no flame hath burned / Life-long, save that by Pindar lit, Such lore leaves cold. I am not turned / Aside to it / More than when, sunk in thought profound / Of what the unaltering Gods require, / My steward (friend but slave) brings round / Logs for my fire."

[14] Again it is unnecessary to look ahead to the invitation to Sestius (*C.* I.4) or later to Horace's description of himself sleeping in the grass by a river (*Epist.* I.14.32–36), since all these elements, indicative of his sympotic persona, are present in epode 13: the sharing of wine and song (… *rapiamus, amici, / occasionem de die … illic omne malum vino cantuque levato*, 3–4a, 17); the impossibility of escaping death (… *dumque virent genua / et decet, obducta solvatur fronte senectus. / … unde tibi reditum certo subtemine Parcae / rupere, nec mater domum caerula te revehet*, 4–5, 15–16); the focus on present pleasures (*cetera mitte loqui … nunc et Achaemenio / perfundi nardo iuvat et fide Cyllenea / levare duris pectora sollicitudinibus, / … 'dulcibus alloquiis*,' 7–10, 18).

[15] Dunn (1989: 100–104) judges the wine-drinker a poet because he rests by a sacred spring, synonymous in Hellenistic literature with poetic inspiration.

The wine-drinker, after all, cannot be named by his career—*est qui*.[16] The contrast between the weary-worn laborers and the wine-drinker at rest pushes a Roman audience and the poet as well to break free from the ordinary in their occupations, which the length and repetition of the priamel insists is nearly impossible, by creating a desire for the new, unexpected, and reinvigorating.

But for all the positive magnetism generated by the attitude and lifestyle of Mr. *Qui*, Horace will be no ordinary wine-drinker. Accordingly in the person and song of the lyric poet the mundane entirely disappears:

> Me doctarum hederae praemia frontium
> dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus
> Nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori
> secernunt populo, si neque tibias
> Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
> Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton.
> quod si me lyricis vatibus inseres,
> sublimi feriam sidera vertice.

> The ivy crown, the reward of learned brows, mixes me with the gods above; the cool grotto and the Nymphs, dancing nimbly with the Satyrs, set me apart from people, as long as Euterpe does not hold back her flute and Polyhymnia retreat from tuning her Lesbian lyre. But if me you register as a lyric bard, with the top of my head I will the stars strike.

Horace dares to exclude himself from all human generalities, including his own sympotic look-a-like. (*secernunt populo*, 32a). Between Horace and *est qui* lies an essential distinction: the description of the wine-drinker leaves "the one" (*est qui*) completely free from any stated ambition. The fellow has no name and consequently no goals, and he takes no action except to simply acquiesce to pleasure (***nec** … **spernit***, 20–21). *Est qui* stays planted firmly on the ground in a human realm. Horace has a professional name, *vates*, which speaks of immortality and divine aspirations. He sports with nymphs and satyrs, lounges with gods, and bumps his head on the stars. The lyricist, in this regard is more comparable to the

[16] There are any number of ways to comprehend the structure of the priamel, some which isolate *est qui* from the other occupations (Collinge, 1961: 108–109; Musurillo, 1962: 233; Porter, 1987: 242; Dunn, 1989: 106–107) and others which include him as a pair, or within a particular set or the whole (Wilamowitz, 1913: 190–191; K.-H., 1884/1958: *praef.* c.1; Commager, 1962: 331; Shey, 1971: 185; Pomeroy, 1980: 41; Connor, 1987: 41–42). However we group *est qui*, Horace leaves him the odd man out chiefly by not assigning him a professional designation. Such a gap incites curiosity about the drinker's identity and leaves space for conflating his character with the poet.

Olympic charioteers, whom Pindar's praise raises to the gods (*metaque fervidis / evitata rotis palmaque nobilis / terrarum dominos evehit ad deos*, 4b–6). Horace, therefore, constructs the foil of the relaxed wine-drinker to tempt his audience with a scene of rest from the work and turmoil of life (cf. Horace's orders for Thaliarchus: ***nec dulcis amores / sperne puer** neque tu choreas*, *C.* I.9.15b–16), while he simultaneously claims that poetry is the vocation that will actualize his own immortal ambitions. Poetry is Horace's powerful work, and song, the greatest occupation of all, should refresh rather than exhaust. There exists a place of repose by a sacred stream, and c.1 quickens our desire to find our way there with the lyricist, prophet and priest living among men but at home with the gods (*vates*, 35).[17]

The appeal of the wine-drinker/lyricist and his place of repose/power answers back to the beginning and end of the *Epodes*, creating an intersection with Horace's iambic criticism, that shared song holds a greater attraction and power than the domination and retaliation evident in the Archilochean-Lykambid tradition, epitomized in Rome's civil conflicts and the character of Canidia. Horace's opening tribute to Maecenas (*Maecenas … o et praesidium et dulce decus meum*, c.1.1–2) and his closing, which champions his eminence as a poet, re-present the power dynamics of friendship from epode 1 but outside of the Archilochean-Lykambid mentality. Horace in effect sings back (re/cants) to the first of his epodes. Friendship and its attendant obligations, which threatened separation and death (epode 1), now provide protection (*praesidium*), cheat the ordinary (*dulce decus*), and end by transforming the mortal into the divine (vv.35–36).[18] Thus, the relationship of poet and patron encapsulates the whole of the song, and prevents the priamel from being

[17] The Augustan poets use the designation *vates* to present themselves as active agents in charting Rome's future. Horace gives his fullest description of vatic power at *Ars* 400–407 (see, in particular, Newman, 1967: 99–206; 1967b). The only time Horace signs his name to an ode he takes the title *vatis* (*reddidi carmen, docilis modorum / vatis Horati*, *C.* IV.6.43–44). From beginning to end this is who Horace is (*C.* I.31.2; II.6.24; 20.3; III.19.15; on the programmatic nature of these poems, see Cody, 1976: 47 n.10).

[18] Each has their role: Horace, poet; Maecenas, benefactor and critic (*iudex poetarum*, see Eidinow, 2010: 82). Belittling Maecenas' role as patron in c.1 jeopardizes the song's unity; cf. Orelli-Baiter-Hirschfelder (1886: 12–13, against G. Hermann, 1842: 8.395–401, who removed vv.1–2, 35–36); Musurillo (1962: 230, 238); Lyne (1995: 70–71). Horace phrases his address to Maecenas around a device common in ritual hymn-form (the separation of the vocative and its exclamatory, *Maecenas … o*; see the more elaborate *Auguste … o … maxime principum*, *C.* IV.14.3–6; cf. *C.* I.26.6–9; 32.13–16; III.21.1–4; 26.9–11; IV.3.17–20; Horace may have had in mind Vergil's similar address to Maecenas, *G.* 2.40–41). Horace, of course, does not follow through but immediately switches to

reduced to an *ad hoc* list. The priamel stands together as a comprehensive foil discrediting solo attempts to gain individual merit, compared to the immortal glory achieved through the cooperative venture of Maecenas and his poet.[19] And so c.1 ends in poetic triumph. With a strum of his lyre and the support and approval of his friend Maecenas, Horace, not Canidia, is off to the stars. In this way, the acts of transgression / responsion, begun in the *Epodes*, continue in the very first of the *Odes* toward resolution: I formulating song with you. C.1 is more than a proem; it is the binding link of one poetic mode (iambic) with another (lyric).

From Outrage to Blessing (C. *I.5; 13–15)*

... miseri, quibus

intemptata nites! me tabula sacer
votiva paries indicat uvida
suspendisse potenti
vestimenta maris deo. (to Pyrrha, *C.* I.5.12b–16)

... pitiful men, whom you, untried, dazzle! Not me—the votive tablet on the sacred wall testifies that I hung up my drenched clothes in devotion to the god ruling the sea.

The lyricist knows. The argument of c.5 centers on Horace's own true knowledge versus his competitors' ignorance. The lyricist understands that passion's hazards are violation and outrage, the very motivations driving the Lykambid tradition: Archilochus scorned aimed his invective against Lykambes and his daughters. But in his *Ode to Pyrrha*, Horace imagines in the mind's eye of his encircling language Pyrrha wrapped around some new young lover (*Quis multa gracilis te puer in rosa / ... urget*, 1–2a), and still his insults against her faithlessness come indirectly and in metaphor. He transfers his anguish to Pyrrha's future frustrated lover (in character as a sailor), and in that lover's destruction (shipwreck) finds his own revenge: the lover will cry at the gods turned against him (*quotiens fidem / mutatosque deos flebit!*, 5b–6a); he in his arrogance will be stunned by Pyrrha's stormy impetuosity (*ut aspera / nigris aequora*

another structural device (priamel). Still, the hint of the hymn-form conveys Horace's gratitude and pays his employer a fine compliment. These two verses are the closest Horace ever comes to paying his patron homage (see White, 1993: 20, 279 nn.39–40).

[19] I admit that Horace's catalogue may not be so negative. The list of occupations together could represent how society through diversity functions together as a whole (cf. Solon, fr. 13.43–56 W). Both as a positive and negative exemplum, then, the priamel speaks against the divisiveness evident in Lykambid iambic as Horace presents it.

ventis / emirabitur insolens, 6b–8); he does not know how fickle the wind can be (*nescius aurae / fallacis!*, 11b–12a). In short, the rival supposes that Pyrrha will remain true, because he is gullible (*qui semper vacuam, semper amabilem / sperat*, 10–11a). His ignorance, combined with hope (*sperat, nescius*, 11), produces misery (*miseri*, 12), and he is not alone. Horace's shift from the single rival to Pyrrha's future lovers ("the miserable," 12) predicts that all of them alike are destined to repeat the same mistake and suffer from it. Not the lyricist—he has had enough of being plunged in the drink; he takes his soaked clothes and dedicates them to Venus (12–16), and in this act of sacrifice he puts himself forward as the voice of experience, bold enough to express pain, but smart enough to know when to stop and powerful enough to follow through on his promise.[20]

Subsequently Horace assigns to his lyre the full power to find the way into and out of a broken lover's endless cycle of retaliatory vengeance (*C.* I.13). In the second of three odes addressed to Lydia (*C.* I.8, 13; III.9), Horace answers back to her when he is mad with the pains of love. To communicate his mood, he upgrades the sigh from his routine *heu* (indicative of lament, cf. c.5.5) to *vae* (pain mixed with anger, c.13.3).[21] The plot is simple: Lydia is talking up her new lover to her "ex-." The "ex-" has had his fill and his insides begin to churn:

Cum tu, Lydia, Telephi
  cervicem roseam, cerea Telephi
laudas bracchia, vae, meum
  fervens difficili bile tumet iecur.

[20] This outcome is similar to Horace's favored variation on the paraklausithyron, the *inclusa amatrix* (*C.* I.25; III.9, 15, 16; IV.13). When Horace shuts the lover inside the door, he empowers the lyricist to leave, which is the power he claims in c.5 over outrage and suffering. For a full discussion of the paraklausithyron and Horace's strategy, see Johnson, 2004: 118–132 and 2004b: 177–178. The lyricist does not always follow through on his threat to quit; compare when Horace hangs up his weapons and lyre on the temple wall, and then prays Venus to strike Chloë one more time (*C.* III.26). Then again, Chloë should detect the not-so-veiled threat. If Venus comes to her one more time, she should welcome the goddess. It may be Chloë's last chance.

[21] *Vae*, more common in early drama, can be a near synonym for *heu*. I would not make much out of the use of one over the other except that c.13 is the only time *vae* appears in Horace. Since he uses it as a transitional word from the cause (Lydia's praise of Telephus, 1–3a) to introduce the effect (rage, 3b–4), it is best to take *vae* as a direct equivalent for the Greek οὐαί, not just a colloquial substitute for *heu*; cf. N.-H., 1970: ad c.13 v.3, who cite Catullus 64.196 for the first example of an absolute use for *vae*. Cat. 64.196, however, is in dispute: vae, misera] miserae Ric. 606, ϑ (see Ellis, 1889: ad loc.; Friedrich, 1908: ad loc.; Thomson, 1970: 89–91).

tum nec mens mihi nec color
    certa sede manet, umor et in genas
furtim labitur, arguens
    quam lentis penitus macerer ignibus.

uror, seu tibi candidos
    turparunt umeros immodicae mero
rixae sive puer furens
    impressit memorem dente labris notam.

non, si me satis audias,
    speres perpetuum dulcia barbare
laedentem oscula, quae Venus
    quinta parte sui nectaris imbuit.

felices ter et amplius
    quos irrupta tenet copula nec malis
divulsus querimoniis
    suprema citius solvet amor die! (*C.* I.13)

When you, Lydia, praise Telephus' rosy neck and Telephus' soft[22] arms, dammit, my liver seething swells with dyspeptic bile. Then my mind slips and I lose my color, and fluid like a thief steals onto my cheeks, proving how deeply inside I am tormented by unquenchable fires. I am torched, whether wild drunken wrangling bruised your white shoulders or the raving boy left his tooth-mark visible on your lips. You would not, if you were in truth to listen to me, expect him to be true, when he like a barbarian violates your sweet kisses, which Venus has wet with a fifth part of her nectar.[23] Happy, three times over and more, whom an unbreakable bond holds fast and a petulant love with its wicked quarrels will not divide before their dying day.

---

[22] N.-H. (1970: v.2): *cerea* means "white as refined *wax*." *Cerea*, however, more naturally would be a yellowish color, which would be a great joke in contrast to Horace's bile, since the liver secretes yellow bile. The fun with color is tempting, but complexion (*rosea*) and texture (*cerea*) are a better tandem for Lydia's praise than two references to complexion. On wax for softness, see Serv. ad Verg. *Ecl.* 2.53.

[23] West reads *pars* as equivalent to *elementum* and "fifth" in the Aristotelian sense of a most pure, non-material substance (πέμπτη οὐσία, πρῶτον σῶμα, or αἰθήρ; Keyser, 1989: 75–77, 80–81, reviews in full the philosophical and medical sources). Therefore, West (1967, 65; 1995: 63–65) translates the phrase "dipped by Venus in the quintessence of her nectar" (also Orelli, 1837: v.16; Wilkinson, 1945: 50, n.1; Commager, 1962: 155; Williams, 1968: 564; Connor, 1987: 197). Others interpret the phrase to be an Alexandrian conceit for the honey mixed with wine to make ambrosia. Accordingly Lydia's kisses would be only a fifth as sweet as Venus' nectar (Wickham, 1874: v.16; N.-H. 1970: v.16; Syndikus, 1972: 160, n.23). There may be a secondary reference to tasting well-mixed (honey/wine) versus unmixed (*merum*) drinks, especially when Venus' sweetness balances well against Horace's burning bile and Telephus' intoxicated slugfest brought on by uncut wine (*immodicae mero / rixae*, vv.10b–11a). A literal rendering allows both allusions.

Horace does not isolate his lyric from anger. Lydia's blather, "Telephus this, Telephus that," when she brags about the softness of his embrace, teases her jilted lover and infects him with a visceral madness, sickening him (his liver exudes the yellow bile, 4). A natural reaction on his part, a moderate one at that, would be to explode back at Lydia with some verbal vengeance.[24] There are only eight cases of bile in Horace, and half result in or anticipate invective (epode 11:16; *S.* I.9.66; II.3.141; *Epist.* I.19.20).[25] Horace became angry at Aristius Fuscus in much the same terms as he does with Lydia (*meum iecur urere bilis*, *S.* I.9.66b; *fervens difficili bile tumet iecur. / … uror*, *C.* I.13.4, 9). Aristius refused to bail him out from his run-in with the pest, and Horace reacted to his friend's betrayal by comparing him to a black ill-omened day and labeling him disloyal (72–74). Horace does not tell us, but it is safe to assume, given the dramatic circumstances, that Aristius walked away from the insults with an amused smile, because he knew they were only his just reward for the joke he was playing on his friend. The stoic philosopher Stertinius, schooling the suicidal Damisippus on the universality of human madness, temporarily plays the literary critic when he critiques the common portrayal of Orestes (*S.* II.3.131–141). Stertinius considers the whole tragedy a logical absurdity, since before the Furies drove Orestes mad he planned and executed his mother's murder, acts of madness. Then, when insanity strikes after the fact—no murder—Orestes merely curses Electra, calls her a Fury, and insults Pylades. Bile ordered him to do this ('*iussit quod splendida bilis*', 141b), and no one would accuse him of being irrational when showing such restraint (*quin ex quo est habitus male tutae mentis Orestes / nil sane fecit quod tu reprehendere possis*, 137–138).[26] The stoic's argument, one of the jokes on which the

[24] Keyser (1989: 77–79) diagnoses Horace's condition based on the four humours. The liver produces the dry, harsh yellow bile; the cold and wet humour, phlegm, comes to the surface, which leaves only the yellow bile burning inside. Keyser speculates that Horace attempts to distance himself from his passions by adopting a clinical description. Such repression would certainly leave the heat trapped inside. Invective, in this case, could be considered a natural defense mechanism—release might prevent an ulcer.

[25] *C.* I.13 is the only case of bile in the *Odes*. See also bile for digestive pain (*S.* II.2.75), insanity and hallucination (*Epist.* II.2.137; *Ars* 302).

[26] Stertinius knows his Euripides. Right when the Euripidean Orestes is on the brink of madness, his sister tries to intervene. He does her no harm, but fighting to keep his senses, he declares that she is one of the Furies (Eur. *Orest.* 253–265). Although no account survives in which Orestes called Pylades names, it is an acceptable assumption.

whole of the satire turns, assumes that bile (madness and rage) prompts the offended to engage in invective as a reasonable response to wrong done. Stertinius plays right into Horace's hands. If we accept his popular version of the tragedy, then the mad "name-calling" Orestes behaves sanely, a clever satiric paradox countering the stoic maxim that only the wise man is sane.[27] And Horace is not immune from bile later in life. When copy-cat poetasters minimize Horace's originality, his bile builds and he blows up at them (*Epist.* I.19.19–34). He ridicules them in mock-heroic style for being mimes and slavish pack-animals (*O imitatores, servum pecus*, 19a), and adds in a quick lesson on iambic poetics by correlating bile and laughter (*ut mihi saepe / bilem*, *saepe iocum vestri movere tumultus!*, 19b–20). Looking back to epode 11, it is sensible that a forlorn lover would wish he had some rage on ('*quod si meis inaestuet praecordiis / libera bilis*', 15–16a), so that he could end his suffering and vanquish rivals. The love-sick could benefit from mockery. After the first strophe in c.13 there is every reason to assume, therefore, that the bile-infected lyricist could be about to sling hard words at Lydia. There is no indication that he will be able to keep rage from erupting: his liver is already seething (*fervens*) and the bile is not letting up (*difficili*).

Then, comes a surprise, counter to every signal given. Although rage has a great physical effect on the lyricist, it has little if any power to induce him to invective. Rage loses its efficacy. For the next four verses the lyricist stays enraged, but does nothing except report his own love-sick symptoms according to a routine list, detailed in fuller form in Sappho 31 L.-P. and Catullus' remake (c.51): the lover loses senses and color, sweats, and is feverish inside and out.[28] Horace's second strophe could

[27] Stertinius' whole account creates excellent satire, since the stoic becomes fouled up in his own logic. If the insane act wisely—the inversion of the Stoic paradox (the fourth in Cicero's account: ὅτι πᾶς ἄφρων μαίνεται, Cic. *Parad.* 27–32)—then only the wise man is insane. This twist in logic explains how Stertinius' Orestes can be a major exemplum in the satire rather than just an overblown "burlesque" of tragedy (e.g., Morris, 1939: v.139). The satirist, a quintessential name-caller, can admit his madness and keep his sanity. See a similar satiric play at Stertinius' expense in *Epist.* I.12.20: "Stertinian *acumen* raves" (*Stertinium deliret acumen*), and apparently at length. Stertinius wrote 220 books in verse on stoicism, which rendered the philosophy more obscure (Ps.-Acro: ad loc.).

[28] Sappho and Catullus are routinely cited as background for c.13 (see Keyser's bibliography, 1989: 75 n. 1). Note that Horace's typical pattern is to start with his models and deviate; here he alters significantly the beginning. My guess is that Horace also changes the end of both, but the last lines of Sappho 31 and Catullus 51 are disputed (see *infra*). Note that Putnam (2006) does not mention c.13 in his book on the *interplay* between

be indebted to these models but not his first, which conveys a harsher mood. Sappho introduces her love-sick condition with a short verse and a half expressing envy for the rival: "That man to me seems like one of the gods" (φαίνεταί μοι κῆνος ἴσος θέοισιν / ἔμμεν' ὤνηρ, 1–2a). Catullus follows suit, but elevates the competing lover's status: "That man to me seems like a god; that man, if it is permissible, surpasses the gods" (*Ille mi par esse deo videtur, / ille, si fas est, superare divos*, 51.1–2). This exalted praise for the rival pays homage to the beloved, who deserves to be the object of divine affection. Horace by contrast fills his opening verses with plenty of envy, but replaces any hint of admiration for his rival with rage (*bilis*). Nevertheless, the seething passion does nothing to improve the singer's situation. He stays in the same love-sick state as Sappho and Catullus, as well as the rejected lover in epode 11, who wished for the kind of rage (*libera bilis*) that could set him free from Inachia. Both lovers, one longing for rage and the other enraged, appear trapped. Their physical symptoms convict both of their love gone wrong (... *amantem languor et silentium / arguit*, epode 11.9–10a; ... *arguens / quam lentis penitus macerer ignibus*, c.13.7–8).[29] Fires continue to eat away the raging lover's insides.

Horace keeps the heat on with the first word of the next strophe. *Uror* (commonly translated, "I am angry") reactivates the expectation that invective may finally be on its way after a brief delay of four verses. Once again the invective against Lydia never materializes. After finding himself sickened by bile, Horace instead identifies his rival as the one who acts without control. The "mad boy" Telephus (*puer furens*, 11) inhabits a violent world of drunken brawls and rough sex (*immodicae mero / rixae ... impressit memorem dente labris notam ... barbare / laedentem oscula*, 10a–15).[30] The mismatched combination, *puer furens*, insinuates that this youth is not the innocent he pretends to be. *Furor* in Horace is a negative emotional state, associated with battle-frenzy (*C.* I.15.27; 37.12; II.16.5), uncontrolled and destructive desire (*S.* II.3.325; epode 11.6; *C.* I.25.14; III.27.36), insanity (*S.* I.3.83; II.3.41, 207, 222, 304; II.5.58;

Catullus and Horace. For Putnam the point to compare is how each poet works with the dangerous and affirming possibilities of *otium* (Putnam, 48–51; 81–92, on C. I. 6, 15, 16, 17, 32; II.16; cf. Fraenkel, 1957: 210–214; Hubbard, 2000: 25–37).

[29] *Arguo* appears elsewhere in Horace only at *Epist.* I.19.6 and *Ars* 449.

[30] The even paced disyllabics, blended with the rhythmic "t-d" combination, imitate the sounds of fists landing (*uror, seu tibi candidos / ... immodicae mero / rixae sive puer furens*, 9–11).

Epist. I.2.62; II.2.90; *Ars* 472), the impetuosity of nature (*C*. III.29.18; *Epist*. I.10.17; 11.10), Rome's civil warring (epode 7.13; *C*. IV.15.17), as well as retaliatory rage (*S*. II.7.66; *C*. I.16.25).[31] The noble lad, attacked by Canidia, swore that he, a Fury, would sit on her breast and tear at her face (*nocturnus* … *Furor*, epode 5.92–93). Canidia promised Horace that she would ride on his hated shoulders (epode 17.74). Telephus is a "hard" lover, his mental state tending to recklessness. This characterization is rich with irony, since Telephus' name conjures up images of restoration. The tragic/epic hero Telephus was cured from his deadly wound, when Achilles, the epitome of unrelenting anger, healed him with the same spear Achilles had used to inflict the injury. Horace offered Achilles and Telephus as an exemplum to Canidia that she should be able to give up her spite (epode 17.8–10). This Telephus (c.13), by contrast, manhandles his girlfriend, while the lyricist directs his bile toward resolution.[32] Horace's only response to Lydia's hurtful praise for her new beloved is to warn her never to expect such a tempestuous man to be faithful (13–14), and he converts every aggressive act by Telephus into praise for Lydia. The bruises Telephus leaves on Lydia make her arms appear whiter. Telephus bites her lips; Venus infuses them with the taste of nectar (9–12, 15–16).

Horace's verbal restraint sets the mood for the song's conclusion. After only sixteen verses he convincingly places the hope of a constant love (17–20) in opposition to bile and fury,[33] by reworking some of the

[31] The only positive *furor* in Horace is his exuberance over his friend's return from the civil wars (*C*. II.7.28). Horace's celebratory "madness" offsets the civil madness Pompeius endured.

[32] *C*. I.8 to Lydia ends with a tamed Achilles and *C*. I.13 begins with Telephus, an out-of-control love-warrior. Horace's lyre to its own advantage has turned the epic-tragic world upside down; compare *Ars* 114–127 on the need for consistent characterization. (Horace knows when and how to bend his own rules.)

[33] The lyre in similar fashion has the power to render the tragic comic (*C*. III.11). Horace retells the story of Hypermestra, the only Danaid who refused to murder her husband and a figure fit for Aeschylean tragedy, to convince Lyde to begin a love affair with him (*C*. III.11.29–52). If Lyde defers to love, then the pains of unfulfilled desire will resolve itself in union. By following the example of Hypermestra, giving in to love, Lyde will not need the lament that Hypermestra asks to have inscribed on her tomb (50–52). Harrison (2007b: 189 n.75) corrects Lowrie (1997: 286–288) slightly: "[Lowrie] sees this plot as strongly elegiac, but there seems little apart from the last stanza which points to elegy." In the two stanzas preceding the last (vv.42b–46), however, Horace employs his favorite variation on the paraklausithyron, a motif common in elegy, when Hypermestra frees her husband Lynceus and allows herself to be shut inside,

same language from the give-and-take with the woman of epode 12 and Canidia. The iambist accused the woman of an insatiable sexual appetite. She kept plying him with presents to his dismay (*Quid tibi vis*, 12.1a) and broke the bed, canopy and all, in her rush to calm her desire (*tenta cubilia tectaque rumpit*, 12.12). She fired back that he had no problem pleasing the other woman Inachia three times a night (*Inachiam ter nocte potes*, 12.15a), but then she ended her counter-attack in frustration, when the man turned tail and ran (*o ego non felix*, 12.25a). Horace expresses similar shock at Canidia's persistent spite with an emotive upgrade, "What more do you want?" (*quid amplius vis*, 17.30a). Now Horace takes these very words (*felices*, *ter*, *amplius*, *ir-rupta*, *tenet*) and remakes fluster and fury over into a love lasting until death, a firm erotic *copula*: *felices ter et amplius / quos irrupta tenet copula*, c.13.17–18a.[34]

The singer delivers his declaration for love, his last four verses, as though it were a definitive prophetic utterance, but he permits interpretation. He allows a point of *aporia* in the transition to the final strophe, since he leaves his motivation for the proverb on love undefined.[35] He may be trying to seduce Lydia with a promise of faithfulness that Telephus will never give her—most likely. He may be choosing for himself an alternative to continual rejection, or only hoping for a better love he sees others enjoying. Through this gap in our knowledge, Horace has us enter into the nebulous world of erotic imagination and involves us in the lovers' argument. The outcome of their song depends on the fine lines

---

an *inclusa amatrix* (… *ego illis / mollior nec te feriam neque intra / claustra tenebo. / me pater saevis oneret catenis / quod viro clemens misero peperci*; cf. C. I.25, III.15, 16; IV.13; Johnson, 2004: 122 n.26). So Harrison notes, 2007b: 192, although he discounts in this case the common elegiac signifier *mollior*. One could also argue that Horace with a heavy touch of tragic irony describes Hypermestra as a better elegist than her sisters, because she knows how to switch roles and play the traditional male role of the rejected lover (*illis mollior*). The slippage in the adjective, *mollior*, masculine/feminine, here is convenient. Further, the slaying of the husbands with the sword is literal in this case, but Horace's expression of the crime, which introduces the mythological narrative, could be a lament spoken by a rejected elegiac lover, *miles amoris*, without changing a word: *impiae nam (quid potuere maius?), / impiae sponsos potuere duro / perdere ferro*, 30–32. If Harrison were to agree that there is an elegiac complement to the tragic plot, it would strengthen his central argument: the elegiac in this lyric is another example of "generic enrichment."

[34] The hapax-legomenon *irrupta* tags the reversal. Horace gives a fine display of Epicurean poetics: the rearrangement / re-performance of elements to create a new substance.

[35] There is some transition, primarily one of logic. As Reckford (1969: 102) points out, love elegy, and we can include any protest of a lover because of a broken heart, is predicated on the "romantic dream of permanence."

between reality and fantasy, and whom we will decide to believe is playing it straight and whom deluded, Lydia or the singer. Is Telephus a passionate sensual lover or a hot-headed drunk? Would a Lydia engaged in such volatile eroticism really have reason to trust that the singer will prove trustworthy and faithful more than any other of her lovers, or would she even care about constancy more than fire? The break from invective proves persuasive. When the singer resists bile's volatile impulses, he gives us reason to believe his version of the story. According to him, Lydia prefers the hard-hitting Telephus, and her infatuation with such a volatile temperament will cost her dearly: *irrupta copula* = *felices ter* ≠ Lydia + Telephus. The singer may start off boiling mad, but in the course of his lyric he reconstructs the entire paradigm for the love affair to favor concord over discord. To stay angry or stay with an angry lover is absurd, because blessed are those who hold on tightly to each other in the bond of love.

Horace's song to Lydia makes us want to believe in the superiority and lasting value of harmony, although it seems a fantasy (a similar effect to epode 16).[36] Commager epitomizes the consensus view: Horace so finely polishes the aesthetic of c.13 by the conventions of love poetry that he cools off the passions.[37] This is precisely the crux of the problem. We all know, or think we know, what we should find in this song: perhaps a jilted lover ridiculing his faithless beloved; a love-struck singer failing to find any relief from his frustration. Horace in the final analysis confronts such expectations. He moves on in the last stanza to the high idealism of unending love, which he presents as a universal truth unlimited by specific circumstances. The lyricist, to spite the rage, stays in control of the passion enough to resolve it into a declaration of harmony, so that incessant, steadfast love stands as a tantalizing anecdote to the jealous bile that sickened the singer at the start.[38] Horace, to spite our expectations, conveys plenty of spirit (cf. *animos … Archilochi*, *Epist.* I.19.24–25a), in that bile and fury do not result in a negative outcome (cf. *non res et agentia verba Lycamben*, 19.25b)—transgression, responsion, fusion.

[36] Within the various reactions to the last stanza (reviewed by Freis, 2005: 67) there is a consistent desire to read Horace's idealism with some degree of seriousness (Segal, 1973: 45).

[37] Commager, 1962: 153–155; N.-H., 1970: 169–170.

[38] I have argued (Johnson 2004: 113–134) that all four odes to Lydia (*C.* I.8, 13, 25; III.9) form a dramatic movement, which as a whole illustrates the seductive power of the lyricist. I should have said more then about c.13.

Permit me to interject a guarded opinion on the controversial ending of Catullus 51.[39] Catullus' love-sick eyes, gazing on his beloved loving another, are covered in darkness (v.12). He perhaps adds four lines:

otium, Catulle, tibi molestumst:
otio exsultas nimiumque gestis:
otium et reges prius et beatas
perdidit urbes. (13–16)

Ease, Catullus, gives you trouble; with ease you grow too restless and your desires out of control; ease destroyed kings and prosperous cities before.

Given the abrupt delayed address (*Catulle*), the lack of a clear thematic connection, the change in tone (*exsultas*, *nimiumque gestis*), and that nothing similar is found surviving in Sappho, these verses could belong to a poem other than 51. This solution is complicated, however, by the fact that only one other Catullan poem is in the Sapphic meter (c.11) and the textual tradition consistently places these lines with c.51. As has been pointed out, sudden shifts in meaning, especially as a song closes, are consistent with Catullan practice. It would not be surprising for him to change-up Sappho at the last moment and try to prod himself out of his love-sick condition by reminding himself to return to a warring-iambic mindset. This would keep him safe. If Horace's Catullus 51 had these last four lines, then we can catch him in c.13, as the movement of his song suggests, alluding to and modifying Catullus (as well as his own epode 11.15–18) by disassociating iambic from a constant state of erotic warfare.[40]

Horace's ode on the "*Ship of?*" (*C.* I.14) jettisons allusion and acknowledges openly the psychological transformation from outrage and insult to blessing, which Lydia's ex-lover presents as an alternate possible reality at the end of c.13. The structure of the two odes mirror each other (four strophes of passion and upset, followed by one final strophe mitigating

[39] "Guarded"—we may not have the correct ending for Sappho 31, and Catullus may have had other reasons for not translating her last lines (for an overview, see Thomson, 1997: 327–331; n.b. note 12); Fraenkel, 1957: 211–212 n.4: "As regards the vexed question whether or not the stanza *otium, Catulle*, etc. belongs to *Ille mihi par est*, I have found myself changing sides so often that I now feel despondent …".

[40] In an intertextual sleight of hand Horace uses the Catullan reference (c.51.13–16, n.b. *beatas / perdidit urbes*) again in his formal re/cantation of iambic, where it stands with the myths proving the destructive violence of anger (*irae … / … altis urbibus ultimae / stetere causae cur perirent / funditus*, *C.* I.16.17–20a). Harrison (2001b: 161–167) contends that the ending of c.51 is modeled on Paris' and Helen's destructive love. This would explain why Horace references c.51 in the middle of retelling (*C.* I.15) and alluding to that erotic epic disaster in two subsequent odes (16, 17).

anger), but this similarity can be eclipsed by the change in addressees: c.13 to Lydia, a named woman (a finite entity); c.14 to an unnamed ship extensively personified (metaphor).[41] This shift requires an audience to see through the extended metaphor of c.14 a more tangible answer back to Canidia's singular iambic mentality. The allegory of the ship includes in it a singer/sailor who journeys away from that state of mind characterized by aggressive antipathy. The singer in the allegory hardly mentions himself (a single *mihi*, 17); nevertheless, when he turns openly introspective in the last strophe about his own emotions and directly asserts that his attitude about the ship has changed, Horace writes the singer-sailor into his lyric as metaphor—a voyager of transformation. C.14 does not leave any gap that permits an audience to theorize about how the final disavowal of rage and antagonism applies to the various persons in the song. The singer ends c.13 by professing an alternative; the singer of c.14 internalizes this into a confession. When the singer fills in this gap, c.14 becomes as much about how the singer perceives the ship as about the ship itself.[42]

To see the "actual" transformation that Horace affords the singer in c.14 it is best to completely bypass the particulars in the over four-hundred-year-old debate on the ship as symbol, whether she is (1) a ship on a dangerous voyage, (2) the Roman state about to become embroiled again in civil war, (3) a woman abandoning a lover for a new affair, or (4) an introspective meditation on the dangers of incorporating weightier, epic themes into lyric *carmina*. When an author, as Horace does here, can so effectively confuse and conceal what is signified that the audience becomes fixated on determining its precise identity, allegory allows the narrator to hide. I am willing to stipulate that each of these readings of

---

[41] N.-H. (1970: 179) on verse 17 (following Fraenkel, 1957: 154): "Horace could not possibly say to a real ship 'nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium.'"

[42] The sailors are the singers in Alcaeus' ship of state poems (6, 326 L.-P); therefore, how the sailors handle the ship receives as much attention as the condition of the ship itself. My guess—we are limited to fragments—is that for Alcaeus the sailors were the focal point: in one song (6) they assume they can control the ship; in the other (326) they lose control. Granted Horace's singer operates in some degree as an outsider from an omniscient point of view, because he comments in the third person on the timid attitude of the sailor toward the ship (*nil pictis timidus navita puppibus / fidit.*, 14–15a) and in the last strophe addresses the ship as absent, which *desiderium* implies. Yet, Horace follows the tradition by including the singer as a primary character for whom the sea-voyage typifies a change of mind. If the poem is about the singer too, then Mendell's argument, the ship is Horace and his life (1938: 156), is not as absurd as Fraenkel represents (1957: 155 n.4); see *infra* for Mendell's influence on Anderson; cf. Seel, 1970: 204–249, who applies the metaphor more generally to humankind.

the allegory has its advantages in order to reassign some of the attention from the ship (a by-product of allegory) to the singer and his dramatic conversion from hostility to blessing, which occurs within the course of the song.[43]

Horace, as in c.13, lays out the first four strophes of c.14 according to an overall pattern of verbal attack (vv.1–16). The structures of rage dominate. The singer calls on the addressee by name, "Ship" (*O navis*, 1; cf. *tu, Lydia*, c.13.1) and immediately reminds her about a destructive cycle of behavior: "new storms will drive you once more out to sea" (… *referent in mare te novi / fluctus.*, 1–2a). Then comes his question, delivered as a second direct address, frontloaded with disgust (*o quid*

[43] A "real ship" is included to be complete and not to contest the song's allegorical nature. Nonetheless, my argument does not intend to favor a particular signifier. Objections to an allegorical interpretation date back to Muretus, 16th century (see Anderson, 1966: 84; Jocelyn, 1982: 331–332), but *navis pro re publica* continues to be the majority view. Alcaeus (6, 326 L.-P.) and Archilochus (fr. 105 W) use the same allegory (cf. Heraclit. Rhet. *All.* 5.2; Fraenkel, 1957: 154–157, Commager, 1962: 164–169, N.-H., 1970: 180–181, and Syndikus, 1972: 162–167, cite examples from poets, philosophers, and historians). Quintilian (8.6.44), as well as the scholiasts, confirm the reading (although Ps.-Acro supposed the ode was directed to Sextus Pompey, and Porphyrio to Brutus). *C.* I.32.5–8 indicates that Horace read Alcaeus' ship allegory as the ship of state (*Lesbio primum modulate civi, / qui ferox bello tamen inter arma, / sive iactatam religarat udo / litore navim*), which does not answer whether Horace followed Alcaeus or one of the other alternatives, or chose to modify Alcaeus in this case. The "ship as state" is inclined to suffocate the ode with politics. Other theories were dismissed with little more than slight mention, until Anderson (1966: 84–98, crediting Mendell, 1938: 145–156; cf. Traill, 1979: 266–270; Woodman, 1980: 60–67) took exception to Quintilian and argued that the ship represents a female lover (e.g., Alc. 73 and the controversial commentary Alc. 306 [14] col. ii L.-P., Page, 1955: 182, 193–196; Thgn. 457–460; n.b. the Hellenistic epigrams, Diosc. 5.54 [1497–1502 *HE*]; Asclep. 5.161 [996–1001 *HE*]; Meleag. 5.204 [4298–4307 *HE*]; compare Woodman, 1980: 61, on Ariadne, Cat. 64.95–98). The problem as Anderson and Woodman see it is that *navis pro re publica* requires a double personification (the ship as person and the state as person), and this is too much in their estimation. It is more logical in their opinion to see the personified ship as a woman, a person. Jocelyn (1982: 332–335) objects, because (1) such instances of allegory are derogatory sexual attacks, and so are not in line with the ode's sympathetic conclusion, and (2) this ship has been wrecked by storms. "She" could not be a consort about to sail off to a rival lover. The invective, however, concentrates on the ship's physical disintegration, and storms (life) could be part of the metaphor. "She" has sailed off before and to do so again would be ruinous. Anderson, then, should not be dismissed, if for no other reason than he clarifies how sharply Horace deviates from the tradition, when he ends his lyric with a prayer of blessing. A metapoetic approach, the ship as poetry, has done nothing to settle the question (typically the ship illustrates the particular genius needed by a poet, a favorite theme in Pindar: *O.* 6.103, 13.49; *P.* 2.62, 3.68, 10.51–54, 11.38–50; *N.* 3.26–28, 5.2; also Cat. 4; Verg. *G.* 2.39–46; Hor. *C.* IV.15.1–4; Ov. *Fast.* 2.3–4; cf. Zumwalt, 1978: 249–254; Davis, 1989: 331–345; Carrubba, 2003: 606–615). Perhaps Lowrie (1997: 130) is right that the debate speaks to our "need for allegory, and the impossibility of … any single signification." Horace does not reduce allegory to

agis?): "What the hell!" Horace in general begins the most virulent of his *iambi* with just such questions.[44] The buried boy screams three questions at Canidia. Since he is a noble lad, his questions come as an ascending tri-colon with fine rhetorical flourish (epode 5.1–10). The protective outsider (epode 6.1–2) demands upfront an explanation from the cowardly-dog-of-a-person he challenges. Horace first asks Inachia what she could possibly be up to and what her gifts could mean (epode 12.1–3). The poet and Canidia trade incriminating questions, and she opens and closes her speech with probing blasts (epode 17.30, 53, 81). Horace gives away his impatience, when he phrases the sympotic invitation of epode 9 in the form of a question to Maecenas (vv.1–10): dreaming of cups at home on land, he is overwhelmed by nausea. The iambist-spectator of epode 7 rifles off questions for twelve verses (1–10, 13–14), interrogating the Romans, who are again rushing off to civil war. The question the singer poses the ship by contrast might seem perfectly colloquial and nondescript, a simple "What are you thinking?," except "*o quid agis?*" echoes Horace's expression for hostility in his definition for the one-sided and destructive type of iambic he disavows. Words stalk Lykambes until he dies (… ***agentia*** *verba Lycamben*, *Epist.* I.19.25b); the offended iambist, a hound on the hunt, will track down his enemy (***agam*** *per altas aure sublata nives / quaecumque praecedet fera*, epode 6.7–8); bitter fates drive the Romans to kill each other (… *acerba fata Romanos* ***agunt***, epode 7.17); Canidia ends her verbal assault, sarcastically asking Horace whether he thinks it right that she desist instead of continuing to act on her rage (*'plorem artis in te nil* ***agentis*** *exitus?'*, epode 17.81). Horace's question to the ship (*o quid agis?*) is not as polite and passive as it sounds.

---

a metaphoric exemplum of one-thing-or-nothing, which is the minimalist approach to allegory despised by J.R.R. Tolkien in his "Foreword" to *The Fellowship of the Ring* (11): "But I cordially dislike allegory in all its manifestations, and always have done so since I grew old and wary enough to detect its presence … I think that many confuse 'applicability' with 'allegory'; but the one resides in the freedom of the reader, and the other in the purposed domination of the author." Allegory accounts for Horace's extended personification of the ship, but it does not require him to limit the symbol's wide ranging applicability (Commager, 1962: 169; Jocelyn, 1982: 330; Santirocco, 1986: 48–49).

44 Horace in the *Epodes* favors the opening question: 7 out of 17, 41 % (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14), compared to 14 out of 103 odes, 13.6 % (I.5, 8, 12, 24, 29, 31; II.11, 17; III. 7, 8, 19, 20, 25, 28). When Horace in the *Odes* opens with a question, he is usually objecting to some behavior or circumstance (all but I.12 and 31; I.24 and III.28 are mildly corrective). These questions can be humorous or tongue-in-cheek, such as when Horace puts the question of why he, a bachelor, is celebrating the *matronalia* into the mouth of Maecenas (III.8).

The question introduces a string of blame. The singer orders the ship to change the unacceptable: "Bravely make for port before it is too late" (... *fortiter occupa / portum*, 2–3a; compare epode 6.3–4: *quin huc inanis verte, si potes, minas / et me remorsurum pete.*). Before there is a chance to think that he may be optimistic about the ship meeting the challenge and coming safely to harbor, he details the ship's decrepit condition part by part for the entire mid-section of his song. He surveys the ship from bottom to top, from bottom to top again (bulwarks, mast, yardarms, hull, riggings, canvas—all dilapidated, vv.4–10), just as the iambist eyes the old hag's body in epode 8.4–10. The gods will not answer the ship's cries for help (*non di, quos iterum pressa voces malo.*, v.10; cf. Maevius' cursed voyage: *preces et aversum ad Iovem*, epode 10.18; Canidia's opening question, '*Quid obseratis auribus fundis preces?*', epode 17.53). To add injury to insult, the singer makes fun of the ship's pedigree, just as the iambist takes aim at the old hag's noble 'heirs' (c.14.11–14; epode 8.11–14). I earlier suggested that the woman of epode 8 was similar to the worst of Semonides' evil-women (the monkey-woman, fr. 7 W.),[45] because she could not see that she was the problem all along. This singer also is not content to let self-blindness pass without comment, and so he introduces his assessment of the ship's poor shape with two short words that force her to agree she has fallen apart, "Yes I know you see it—how old you are" (*nonne vides*, 3). He rounds out the attack by serving notice that no sailor trusts the ship and issuing one last command for her to be careful (*cave*), that is, unless she intends to give herself to the winds for them to play with her like a toy (... *tu, nisi ventis / debes ludibrium, cave.*, 15–16). If the ship persists in her present course, the winds are the only ones who could possibly enjoy her. The argument in the description of the ship, moving logically from her unsound condition, to unanswered prayers, to a useless noble pedigree, to the ship-wrecking winds, imitates a "threat-prophecy."[46]

Let me join in the mockery—it's contagious—I have a question for Horace: *o vatis, referent in mare te novi fluctus. o quid agis?* ("What the hell!—why head back into the type of iambic you reject?").[47] And

[45] See epode 8, Chapter 3.

[46] Cairns, 1972: 84–89: "The speaker warns / prophesies / wishes that the addressee may in future find himself in a new position in which he will no longer incommode the speaker. The purpose of this threat is to induce the addressee to take faster action to relieve the speaker's present discomfort (85)." Here the lyricist delivers the threat as an accomplished hard reality. Woodman's paraphrase catches the severe tone (1980: 66).

[47] I am not trying to be obtuse—to deflect some of the attack back on myself—but

I have another question for me, the audience. When Horace makes the polemic in the first four strophes obvious enough, why am I so prepared to overlook the hostility and read this twisted condition of a warning, conditional (*nisi*, v.15) and therefore subject to the overtones of cynicism ("Take care, unless ..."), as a gentle remonstrance meant for the ship's own good rather than a angry reproach finding some pleasure in the ship's imagined destruction? Although Horace withholds a definitive answer to my question until the last strophe, he gives several indicators that this lyric is not captivated by rage and destruction. There is good reason to assume, in spite of these parallels to previous invectives, that the singer bears no ill-will for the ship. The lyric is constructed so that it has a progressive and measurable mollifying effect on the singer and audience. Horace begins with a question that signals blame, but he restricts the query to a single question not a series that would increase intensity. Likewise, he ends his warning to the ship with a single *cave*, and avoids the anadiplosis (*cave, cave*) that marked the severe anger of the iambist in epode 6.11. The mode of allegory overall fits the softer mood, since it allows Horace to present flaws indirectly and pass on delivering a more direct and therefore cutting list of deformities. The broken down parts of the ship hide specifics, that is, Horace stays completely within the restraints of allegory. He does not blend any persons into the metaphor, as he does for the nautical images used to describe the seductive Pyrrha and her obtuse lover (*te ... vacuam ... amabilem*; *insolens ... qui ... credulus ... qui ... nescius*, *C.* I.5.9–12). These might be subtle attempts at restraint, but they create the space needed for the singer to undergo a transformation and for the audience to welcome his conversion from abuse to blessing, which Horace conveys beautifully in the rhyme and meter of the final strophe.[48]

all three of the prevalent readings for the ship as symbol can be justified through cross-references (state, cf. epode 7; woman, cf. epode 8; the dangers inherent in writing epic and about love, cf. epodes 9, 14, 17). Horace's genius, I think, controls all three possibilities simultaneously (*supra*: allegory and applicability).

[48] Horace *parades* his lyric prowess in the constant metrical and thematic *variatio* through the first half of *Odes* I (Lowrie, 1995: 33–48), and while "Horace's ode" [c.14] may be "less than a masterpiece," its interaction with his iambics and its deviation from abuse to blessing establish that he was motivated by more than "a perverse determination to write allegory" (N.-H., 1970: 181). Horace signals the singer's transformation so subtly but persuasively that he sets up this shift to be the primary play in the poem (Cairns, 1972: 219–220, appreciates the *krisis* this creates), and through it he gives the Archilochean-Lykambid mindset over to a lyric modality.

The singer without any hesitation for all but four verses (1–16) keeps all eyes on the ship. His song could have ended at the last warning, the final word (*cave*, 16) and his argument would have been complete. Any introduction of a new perspective would have been reduced to guesses based on some shifts in form. Horace, however, lets the antagonist keep talking, and at the last he admits something about himself. He has suffered a change. His attitude of opposition gives way:

> nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium,
> nunc desiderium curaque non levis,
> interfusa nitentis
> vites aequora Cycladas. (17–20)

> Just recently you harassed and wore me out; now I miss you and care deeply for you; pray avoid the waters surging between the bedazzling Cyclades.

These are a lover's words, distress and desire (*sollicitum*, *taedium*; *desiderium*, *cura*),[49] but in this case distress loses any association with desire. Horace writes the change from one state to the other into two verses (17–18) and demarcates clearly between the two sets of emotions. The rhyming combination *nuper / nunc* divides the two into separate verses and temporal spheres: destructive love (our past); constructive love (our present). "Worried" (*sollicitum*) and "worn-out" (*taedium*), bound together by an agreement that renders the caesura hardly a pause at all (16), threatens to run over via assonance into "wanting" (*desiderium*), but Horace breaks the next verse (17) so cleanly (*nunc*) that "wanting" is "caring" (*desiderium curaque*) without the emotional baggage. There is no emotive basis left for abuse. The result is complete conversion. The singer alters his original hard warnings against sailing at all into a prayer that the ship sail on but sail well in safe waters. This blessing puts an entirely different spin on the song and cues the audience to review and revise any elements indicative of hostility into expressions of concern and sympathy. In other words, Horace composes the song so that the

[49] *Nuper* and *nunc* together at the head of their verses justifies translating them as if they were paired: "just recently, just now" (cf. Cairns, 1972: 219–220). The singer wants to be seen right at the moment of change (also *nuper* … *nunc*, *C.* III.26.1–3). *Sollicitum*, *taedium*: *desiderium*, *cura* are erotic words in Catullus and the elegists (K.-H., 1884/1958: v.17; Commager, 1962: 167 n. 12; N.-H., 1970: vv.17–18), not so much in Horace. When he uses them together here in rapid succession (the only time he uses *taedium*), they are a highly emotive package, and he adds *non levis* to punch up the comparatively bland *cura* at verse-end. For *sollicitum* in the sense of "harassed," see the curse on Lyce: *et cantu tremulo pota Cupidinem / lentum sollicitas*, *C.* IV.13.5–6a.

audience goes through an interpretive process, replicating for them the transformation from attack to blessing which the singer has experienced. Through his iambic-lyric transitioning Horace is rewriting the Lykambid version of iambic by showing that the cycle of destruction criticized in the *Epodes* can be interrupted and changed. The *telos* for iambic need not be revenge and domination.

Horace has not gone soft. He is transgressing boundaries and singing the "wolf" away:[50]

> namque me silva lupus in Sabina,
> dum meam canto Lalagen et ultra
> terminum curis vagor expeditis,
>   fugit inermem. (*C.* I.22.9–12)
>
> A wolf in the Sabine woodland, while I sing my Lalage and wander beyond my property-line without a care to ensnare me, flees me unarmed.

Spite may seem remote and safe, if it is placed in conventional characters, like a witch, or as in *C.* I.15 when Paris takes Helen (1–4), the Greeks in concert retaliate (5–8), the gods and heroes ready rage (… *iam galeam Pallas et aegida / currusque et rabiem parat*., 11–12; … *ecce furit te reperire atrox / Tydides, melior patre*, 27–28), and the wrath of Achilles so burns in his followers that there is no stopping the flames from consuming Trojan homes (33–36). This tragic tale of violent retaliation we know well. We can pretend that it belongs to epic more than lyric and read it as another case of rage's poison, placed for our convenience as a negative paradigm right before Horace formally recants (*C.* I.16). But, how flattering can it be for one lyricist (Horace) in prophetic voice to describe another (Paris) as a stag, caught off-guard by the wolf and, therefore, having no recourse other than to run, faint-of-heart and out-of-breath? Horace through the venerable Nereus' prophecy dooms Paris' pacifistic lyre (*imbelli cithara carmina divides*, 15) and calls him soft:

> quem tu, cervus uti vallis in altera
> visum parte lupum graminis immemor,

[50] For comparable metapoetic readings of *Integer vitae*, *C.* I.22, and *C.* I.15, see Davis, 1987: 67–78; 1991: 23–28. His smart work speaks for itself: "… it is conceivable the fugitive *lupus* of the *Integer vitae* is a kind of literary "ghost from the past", a trope for the sort of defamatory poetry that the lyric speaker is now claiming to have transcended (1987: 72)." Davis' "transcend" is the right word, more powerful than "contravene." Horace is moving iambic-lyric beyond the frustrated conclusion of epode 12 (predicated on the Lykambid tradition), where the iambist is frightened by the woman's taunts and runs away to her dismay ('*o ego non felix, quam tu fugis ut pavet acris / agna lupos capreaeque leones!*', 25–26).

sublimi fugies mollis anhelitu,
non hoc pollicitus tuae. (*C.* I.15.29–32)

You, as a deer without thought for the meadow, when it has seen a wolf across the vale, will flee, full of fear (*mollis*), straining, gasping for breath—you did not promise this to your lover.

Horace, standing up to the prowling wolf, represents the full range of iambic-lyric: the spirit of Archilochus to Sappho to Alcaeus (*Epist.* I.19.23–34). The shades in the underworld listen closely to both Sappho and Alcaeus, more intently to the hard than the bitter-sweet:

Aeoliis fidibus querentem

Sappho puellis de popularibus,
et te sonantem plenius aureo,
Alcaee, plectro dura navis,
dura fugae mala, dura belli!

utrumque sacro digna silentio
mirantur umbrae dicere, sed magis
pugnas et exactos tyrannos
densum umeris bibit aure vulgus. (*C.* II.13.24–32)

... on her Aeolian lyre Sappho playing sadly of her fellow girls, and you with golden plectrum, Alcaeus, intoning with fuller song hardships at sea, evil hardships of exile, hardships of war! The shades are in awe of both as they sing words worthy of sacred silence, but more they throng round and pack shoulder to shoulder to hear and drink in tales of war and tyrants forced out.

... Alcaei minaces
Stesichorive graves Camenae,

... spirat adhuc amor
vivuntque commissi calores
Aeoliae fidibus puellae. (*C.* IV.9.7–8, 10–12)

... the Muses of Alcaeus threatening or the Muses of Stesichorus grand,

... the Aeolian girl's love still breathes and her sexual heat trusted to the lyre lives on.

Horace consistently represents Alcaeus' aggressive lyre as positive (*C.* II. 13.27; IV.9.7; *Epist.* I.19.29; II.2.99).[51] Polyhymnia will not "flee back"

[51] Although Horace alludes often to Alcaeus' poetry, he names him on only one other occasion than these four (C.I.32.5–12). Again Alcaeus (*ferox bello*) has the power to sing both in war (*inter arma*) and peace (*iactatam religarat udo / litore navim*).

from tuning all of the Lesbian lyre for Horace (… *nec Polyhymnia / Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton.*, *C.* I.1.33–34). Sometimes you can't stay primping your hair and singing to your woman in the bedroom (*C.* I. 15.14–16), while the war rages around you. Horace is not turning tail on iambic, running away, and hiding. His iambic criticism does not lose its spirit nor prevent his lyre from handling mockery. Its polyphony refuses to concede a negative *telos* to invective by creating harmony from supposed division.

Re/cantation (C. I.16; 17)

Inviting Consonance (C. I.16)

O matre pulchra filia pulchrior,
quem criminosis cumque voles modum
pones iambis, sive flamma
sive mari libet Hadriano.

non Dindymene, non adytis quatit
mentem sacerdotum incola Pythiis,
non Liber aeque, non acuta
sic geminant Corybantes aera,

tristes ut irae; quas neque Noricus
deterret ensis nec mare naufragum
nec saevus ignis nec tremendo
Iuppiter ipse ruens tumultu.

fertur Prometheus addere principi
limo coactus[52] particulam undique
desectam et insani leonis
vim stomacho apposuisse nostro.

---

[52] Bentley (1711: v.13), prompted by Scaliger, recommended "coactam," which subsequently S.B. (1985) printed. The change edits Horace so that he conforms closely to tradition, that Prometheus on his own created man. This would be over-correcting, since there are variations in which Prometheus was directed by the gods. Also "force" may apply more broadly: "Prometheus was, it seems, driven to desperate expedients by the scarcity of raw materials" (N.-H., 1970: v.14). "Coactam" allows the parallel *fertur … addere … et … apposuisse*, but the required change in tense would not be any easier than taking the parallel to be *coactus* (*esse*) *et apposuisse* or reading the *et* as adverbial. However *et* is read, S.B. inserts too clean of a break with his comma after *undique*. *Desectam* holds the clausulae and the thought together by associating *particulam* and *vim*.

irae Thyesten exitio gravi
stravere et altis urbibus ultimae
stetere causae cur perirent
funditus imprimeretque muris

hostile aratrum exercitus insolens.
compesce mentem; me quoque pectoris
temptavit in dulci iuventa
fervor et in celeris iambos

misit furentem. nunc ego mitibus
mutare quaero tristia, dum mihi
fias recantatis amica
opprobriis animumque reddas.

O daughter, prettier still than your pretty mother, place any limit you want on attacking iambics, in fire or the Adriatic sea if you please. Not when Cybele, not when the Pythian god enshrined rattles the mind of their priestesses, not when Liber, not when the Corybantes resound their brazen cymbals shrill, do they disturb as deeply as bitter anger, which neither Noric sword frightens away, nor the ship-wrecking sea, nor raging fire, nor Jupiter in person plummeting down in terrifying onslaught. Prometheus, so they say, forced to include in our primordial clay a part carved from every living thing, also placed in our stomach violence from the crazed lion. Anger served up abject ruin to Thyestes, and anger has always been the prime reason that prosperous cities are reduced to rubble and the army of their enemies triumphant plows under their walls. Control your temper. The passions of sweet youth also governed my heart and drove me seething into hasty iambic. Now I want to exchange the bitter for the mild, if only, once the insults have been charmed away with song, you become my friend and return your favor to me.

Horace's opening and closing invitations sound tender, but his re/cantation brings him back to face the hard reality in the Lykambid tradition, its persistent and infectious nature. At the end of the *Epodes* Horace engaged this perspective in the person of Canidia. Although he did not stay silent, he did allow her the last word, and she declared her commitment to retaliatory rage with a rhetorical question that assumed that hers was the reasonable position. Now right in view of an extended overture, illustrating the reconstruction of Canidia's approach into his brand of communal poetics, Horace regresses back to a repentant posture on a massive and personal literary scale: "The passions of sweet youth also governed my heart and drove me seething into hasty iambic (c.16.22–25a)." Horace admits a past affinity with "Canidia."[53] What could Horace

[53] I use "Canidia" here as a type and am not implying that the ode must address

accomplish by making such a confession, when it so complicates his disavowal of the Archilochean-Lykambid tradition? Since he defends his iambic achievement late into his career as staunchly as he disavows a particular representation of it, his confession here is likely not an outright rejection of iambic *per se* but another attempt to define his own iambic praxis. Like his iambic criticism in the *Epodes* and in *Epistle* I.19, the recantation of c.16 is both negative and positive. The *de ira* (5–25a) along with the opening and closing invitations (1–4; 25b–28) work together to illustrate how Horace can renounce the Lykambid tradition and still lay claim to a spirited iambic.

As far as can be known from surviving Latin, Horace coined the word *recanto*, but did he invent it to reduplicate the title Παλινῳδία (Stes. 192 *PMG* = Pl. *Phdr.* 243a; Isoc. *Hel.* 64), limited to the sense that eventually became popular in English from the sixteenth century on, "to recant" (παλινῳδέω, παλινῳδία) or does he include some idea of responsion (παλιν-ῳδία)? Horace's use of (*re-*) compounds covers all three general denotations: "back to," "back again," "back away from." Nonetheless, when he invents with the *re*-prefix, whether he is coining a usage or utilizing an uncommon compound, he is inclined to use the prefix to indicate some degree of reciprocation (a back-and-forth; an answering back; return) or to intensify an assertive rather than primarily compliant state ("retort, resist" rather than "withdraw" or "annul"). This overall pattern argues that the compound *re-canto* connotes an on-going dialogue, taking place in song, a verbal back-and-forth (compare the invention of the lyre in Homer's and Horace's *Hymn to Hermes* (ἐπὶ δὲ ζυγὸν ἤραρεν ἀμφοῖν, / ἑπτὰ δὲ *συμφώνους* ὀΐων ἐτανύσσατο χορδάς./ … ἣ δ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς σμερδαλέον *κονάβησε*., Hom. *h. Merc.* 51–54; *tuque, testudo*, ***resonare*** *septem / callida nervis*, *C.* III.11.3–4).[54] The

specifically mother Canidia and her daughter. Since she more than any other Horatian figure embodies iambic rage, when Horace refers to his past iambics and leaves the names of the women involved anonymous, speculation in the manuscript titles and commentaries focus on Canidia (see *infra*).

[54] Again the interplay between Horace's *Hymn to Mercury* and the Homeric *Hymn to Hermes*, when the god invents the lyre and makes the strings resound like the responsive lampoons, strongly suggests that Horace knew the lyre's association with iambic exchanges at festivals, and the correlation of musical (strings) and human responsion (lampoons); see Introduction. Compare one of Vergil's earliest pastorals (ecl. 3): Menalcus and Damoetas begin their singing competition by exchanging insults (1–48). Their referee Palaemon declares that the Muses love reciprocal song (*amant alterna Camenae*, 59), and the competition is resolved when he declares that both rustics deserve the prize (108–111); cf. Meliboeus, Corydon, and the bees (*et cantare pares et respondere parati*;

essence of Horace's iambic program is precisely where he locates it in this lyric, right in the middle of insults sung back again (... *recantatis amica / opprobriis*, 16.27–28a).[55] This lyric is Horace's answer back, which by singing again through the argumentation of his iambics creates a responsion, complicity not just compliance. And the process of the back-and-forth in song invites resolution (fusion), a *telos* comparable to ritual iambic (*dum mihi / fias ... amica ... animumque reddas*, 16.26b–28). This is how Horace separates iambic from the Lykambid tradition, by inviting together multiple voices and perspectives (*C.* I.16.26b–28), a "singing-with" rather than a "singing-at." This, palinode, then, will complement the duet with Canidia (epode 17), since as the defining act of his criticism Horace will invite consonance into iambic, that is, sharing song will be the force driving the resolution.[56] Again I intend "resolution,"

---

eque sacra resonant examina quercu, ecl.7.5, 13). Daube (1974: 94), who interprets *recanto* as nothing more than "retraction," is right to "wonder whether there is not even more to his (Horace's) choice of *recantare*." Horatian practice with exceptional (*re-*)compounds suggests more than a retraction. Note the following: *recino* ("sing in answer" or "repeatedly," *C.* I.12.3, III.27.1, 28.11, *Epist.* I.1.55; Horace does not use *recino* in the sense of "remove by magical means;" compare *recano*, Plin. *H.N.* 28.18, 29.69); *remisceo* ("intermingle" so as to be inseparable, *C.* IV.15.30, *Ars* 151; cf. Sen., *Const.* 7.4, *Epist.* 71.16.5); *remugio* ("bellow back," epode 10.19, *C.* III.10.6; cf. Cat. 63.29; Verg. *A.* 6.99, 9.504, 12.722; Stat. *Theb.* 12.602); *reno* (of rocks floating back to the surface of the sea, epode 16.25); *recalcitro* ("kick back against," *S.* II.1.20); *redono* ("to give back," *C.* II.7.3); *regero* ("throw back against," *S.* I.7.29; cf. Cic. *Fam.* 15.19.1; Quint. 11.1.22; Tac. *Hist.* 3.78.17); *reluctor* ("to fight back against," *C.* IV.4.11; cf. Verg. *G.* 4.301; Ov. *Am.* 3.4.14; Tac. *Ann.* 4.22.6); *remordeo* ("bite back," epode 6.4; cf. Lucr. 3.827, 4.1135; Verg. *A.* 1.261; Juv. 2.35; Liv. 8.4.3); *renodo* ("tie back," epode 11.28, as opposed to "loosen," Val. Fl. 5.380); *renuo* ("nod in dissent, decline," *Epist.* I.16.49, II.2.63; Cic. *Rab. Post.* 36.2, *Cael.* 27.11; Ov. *Met.* 8.325; Tac. *Ann.* 1.76.4; Sil. 10.49); *resurgo* ("rise in resistance," *C.* II.17.14, III.3.65; Verg. *A.* 1.206; Liv. 24.45.3); *retego* ("to reveal against someone's will," *C.* III.21.16; Verg. *A.* 1.356). There are few exceptions: *redono* ("give up resentment," *C.* III.3.33); *relabor* ("move backwards" or "regain," epode 17.18; *C.* I.29.11; *Epist.* I.1.18); *resorbeo* ("suck back into," *C.* II.7.15); *retracto* ("withdraw," *C.* II.1.38). Conversely, Horace does not use *refigo* in its most common sense of "take down" with the intention of annulling (epode 17.5; *C.* I.28.11; *Epist.* I.18.56).

[55] Admittedly when I set this recantation within the context of Horace's iambic criticism, I accentuate the serious side of the song. Horace, ever a satirist at heart, hardly ever separates the serious from the playful, and most readers readily see in c.16 the parody or burlesque of Hellenistic philosophical treatises (n.b. the mythic exaggeration in the *de ira*: Wickham, 1874: *praef.* c.16; also Commager, 1962: 136–139; Dyson, 1968: 175–178; N.-H., 1970: xiv, 204; West, 1995: 78–80; compare Connor, 1987: 80). Horace's recantation like the rest of his iambic criticism, requires locating the significant within the tease (Syndikus, 1972: 186).

[56] So does Ben Jonson in *Cynthia's Revels*: Crites: "You (two and two) singing a *Palinode*" (Act 5, scene 11). Then Amorphus and Phantaste sing the *Palinode* in responsive couplets, and the chorus responds to each, "Good Mercury defend us."

"fusion," "complicity," and "diversified plurality" to be synonyms, signifying that participants realize through opposition some sense of mutualism (see Introduction).

When Horace consigns his iambic to his youth (*in dulci iuventa*, 16.23), he does not in this re/cantation dismiss angry words, as if he were a Cicero defending Caelius' youthful indiscretions—"after all, boys will be boys." As in the *Epodes*, Horace begins by illustrating the destructive, infectious nature of an iambic devoted to anger and domination. The *de ira* is the heart of c.16, twenty out of twenty-eighty verses, describing anger's vast power (5–25a). Rage is irrepressible, because it invades every human being at every level of experience. Horace moves through a series of negative comparisons—does not strike as hard as anger (*non* ... *sic* ... *ut irae*)—that brings anger down from the supernatural (the gods do not so possess their followers, 5–8) to the natural world (not disaster at sea, not fire, not lightening, 10–12) into the human heart (Prometheus placed the crazed lion into humans at creation, 13–16), so that anger encompasses the legendary past (the ruin of Thyestes, 17–18) and scenes in everyday life and history (the fall of rich cities to hostile forces, 18–21). The Romans knew from first-hand experience what hostile armies could do. Horace takes the uncommon and extraordinary force of anger, which could be thought of as exceptional, and through mythic exempla conveys it into the ordinary and common, and therefore pervasive. Anger knows no particular owner: it is not the sole possession of any one individual to the exclusion of another. Anger is an ingredient of the human heart.

Such an appraisal of the power of rage and its words gives the song authenticity. The progression in the *de ira* from the supernatural to the natural and common shows that Horace is well aware that tossing iambic rage into the fire or sea means resisting the whole of human experience, and one reason the ode is so compelling is that it translates easily into our own lives. We all know it is hard to fight back against anger and to throw hurtful words away. Children on the playground, facing the taunts that are a common part of gaining and assigning status, do not believe the adage their parents repeat to teach them that it is best to keep their instincts to anger in check: "sticks and stones may break your bones, but names will never harm you." Although children have never heard of Lykambes, they understand (*experior*) the Lykambid tradition: "sticks and stones may break your bones, and words can really kill you." As much as we may say there is a difference in degree and quality between words and acts, we seldom distinguish the two (whether in our lives at home, work, or in politics). In human experience words have an

effect, the perlocutionary component of speech-act theory, and certain outcomes for particular words are predictable enough that we come to see the words themselves as containing within them good and bad.[57] "How come you never tell me you love me?" The action itself is insufficient without the word. "Don't use the word hate." The word itself is too severe whether acted out or not. We playfully, like an actor of Othello off-stage, avoid naming a certain word out of fear that it may happen (depression becomes recession; war becomes conflict), and seriously discuss banning certain words from acceptable speech in whatever context they may be spoken, from court proceedings to a stand-up comic routine (the "n-word"). Words against us and for us, and we presume to know which words they are, constitute an act, and, of course, this means that words-actions are very hard to reverse, although speakers try to do so.[58] Canidia

[57] Inasmuch as Horace's re/cantation associates abusive words with violent acts and destruction (*criminosis … iambis*, 2–3; *fervor et in celeris iambos / misit furentem*., 24–25a), it intersects with speech-act theory. J.L. Austin in his landmark work on speech theory (*How To Do Things With Words*, 1962) sets out three elements in the act of speaking: (1) the locutionary act: the act of saying something; (2) the illocutionary act: the performance in the speaking; (3) the perlocutionary act: saying something produces effects; cf. Searle (1969; 1975: 59–82); Smith (1990: 29–61); Alston (2000). Austin is careful in definitions to separate the meaning of a word from its use, and speech-act theory properly draws attention to the performative aspect of speech, which often is different from the words spoken. The intended outcomes for words can be hard to interpret, so that it is not always so simple to read between spoken word and intended action. The difficulty is compounded when the word is written or staged (Barchiesi, 2002: 68). When it comes to invective on an experiential level, meaning and the performative conflate. The perlocutionary aspect of angry words is so intense and consistently derogatory that we tend to believe that the words themselves, devoid of any performative context, have a definitive static sense. Consequently, we automatically read into *Palinode* a very specific sense of justice: the aggressor rightly apologizes to the victim. Horace's song, of course, stays on the level of emotion and experience not theory, and universalizes the experience. If all are involved in anger, everyone is simultaneously a potential aggressor and victim.

[58] Compare Catullus' joke that Volusius' poems can be burned to fulfill the vow his beloved made to destroy the worst poets' best verses, if Catullus returned to her and gave up his iambs (c.36); see Chapter 1. Horace includes enough amusement in his re/cantation—the play with mythology (13–18), the grandeur of divine rituals compared to Horace's quarrel with a lover (5–8), the provisional apology (*dum* …, 26)—that some find it hard to take the re/cantation too seriously (Wickham, 1874: *praef.*, c.16; Cairns, 1978: 549–550; Quinn, 1980: *Introduction*, c.16; West, 1995: 78–80). Yet, the general form of Horace's song introduces a fundamental change in tone compared to Catullus'. Horace writes his re/cantation of iambic into lyric, while Catullus opts for hendecasyllables, another mode for invective. The complete burlesque of Catullus 36 shows Horace's c.16 to be a little more on the serious side of serio-comic (Connor, 1987: 80–81), but not too serious (Davis, 1991: 75–77). Horace, as I have argued, places laughter in with the rage as opposed to using laughter as rage. He is more apt to sing together competing iambic

would seem to be correct (epode 17.81): "Should I cry over the results of my skill (my spells and chants), accomplishing nothing at all against you?" Her war of words is based both on the assumed right of using speech to dominate an opponent and the impossibility of keeping the war from escalating once it starts.

This particular paradigm of oppositional power dynamics is part of the literary history for the title *Palinode* and is read across the commentaries into Horace's c.16.[59] Stesichorus, the author of the original *Palinode*, defamed Helen for her affair with Paris which had led to the Trojan War. Helen struck the poet with blindness. Stesichorus reversed his judgment on Helen, and she responded by restoring his sight (Stes. 192 *PMG* = Pl. *Phdr*. 243a; Isoc. *Hel*. 64).[60] There is in this scenario what could best be called a retraction, similar to an apology demanded by a superior, but no meaningful *trans*action that would signify a reparation of the breech between the two parties resulting from or in commonality. Any agreement reached by Stesichorus and Helen, therefore, could not rightly be called mutual. The weaker (Stesichorus) simply submitted to the greater power (Helen), and this act was viewed as restoration. There is no indication that Stesichorus anticipated that Helen would have the power over him that she did, but according to this paradigm once a stronger party is aggrieved it can only be appeased on the basis of retracting harmful words, which signifies a complete surrender to its will. When Horace in epode 17 invoked Stesichorus in his effort to persuade Canidia to relent, the fact that she refused signaled that she did not accept Horace's submission as legitimate or sufficient. She saw the danger in his lying lyre (*mendaci lyra*, epode 17.39).[61] This representation of the *Palinode*

---

strands than Catullus (cf. Cat. 116). Ovid in this regard is closer to Horace than Horace to Catullus. For the complexities involved in accepting words, an apology, as adequate reparation for a wrong committed, compare Murphy and Hampton, 1988; Brooks, 1999; Lazare, 2004.

[59] The most notable exception is N.-H., 1970: 203.

[60] For sources and introductory bibliography on Stesichorus' *Palinode/s*, see Chapter 4 on epode 17.42–45. Horace in recanting twice (epode 17 and c.16) could be rivaling Stesichorus, who according to some wrote two *Palinodes* (fr. 192 and 193 *PMG*).

[61] See again Chapter 4 (Horace's Lying Lyre) for details on Horace's attempt to trap Canidia. Cairns (1978: 549) reads well the oppositional forces at work in epode 17, and summarizes Horace's and Canidia's attitudes: "*Epode*, 17 is a patently and ironically insincere recantation. Its heavy emphasis on the power topos (B7) is consonant with its insincerity. It is only Canidia's power which has caused Horace's ostensible repentance; and he has not really changed his mind, but simply become willing to lie in order to escape the sufferings brought on him by Canidia's power." I would add that the lying lyre is more aggressive than passive.

maintains the control of the stronger over the weaker, although who is weaker and who stronger may turn out to be the surprise. Horace's polite and gracious address in c.16 (v.1), the promise to let the iambs be destroyed (vv.3–4), the denunciation of anger (vv.5–21), the confession of juvenile temper (vv.22–25a), the change from bitter to gentle verses (*nunc ego* … / *mutare quaero* …, 25b–26; cf. *C.* I.14.17–18a, *nuper* … *taedium*, / … *nunc desiderium*) together look like a full apology in outline form that should now be acceptable to the injured party.[62] This outline though is not the whole story on Horace's lyric fun with re/singing iambics. Like Plato, Horace predicates his performance of re/cantation on the reciprocal need for healing (*Phdr.* 243a3: ὦ φίλε, καθήρασθαι ἀνάγκη; *dum mihi* / *fias* … *amica* … *animumque reddas*, 16.26–28).

The paradigm of oppositional power dynamics is not the only rendition of the *Palinode*—*nuper aut nunc*. Stesichorus likely remains in the remote background as the primary referent for Horace's re/cantations, but Horace's adaptation in c.16 also captures the larger context of Plato's argument in the *Phaedrus*.[63] There Socrates cites Stesichorus' *Palinode* (243a) to implement a major transition in the dialogue on the nature of love and knowledge:

[62] Cairns (1978: 547, 549) includes the speaker's surrender as a *topos* of the genre-palinode and cites *C.* I.16; cf. Griffiths, 2002: 67–69. Accordingly the elements of parody in the *de ira* are viewed not as ironic but as part of Horace's strategy for making his apology and erotic invitation more charming by gaining a smile from his beloved (e.g., Commager, 1962: 136–139; Cairns, 1978: 549; Syndikus, 1995: 28–29), or at least by downplaying the severity of their rift (Wickham, 1874: *praef.* c.16). How big a smile can be a question, since the final proviso (*dum mihi* / *fias* … *amica*, 26b–27) could contain a veiled threat to continue the abuse, if the woman does not relent as well: Williams, 1980: 1–5; Murgatroyd, 1982: 238–239; compare Cairns, 1978: 550, "the gentle blackmail of *dum*," with Connor, 1987: 80–81, who, while writing on humor in Horace, finds his "hard-headed" threat too fierce to be humorous. Since Horace words his condition so that it contrasts with the harder sarcasm at the end of Catullus 42 (see epode 17, Chapter 4; Putnam, 2006: 74–75, 82–86), it is more probable that Horace is making a gentle offer than issuing a stern warning.

[63] Socrates translates his ritual of cleansing (his palinode) into a metaphor on the sea (243d3–5): "And so since this man uncovers my shame and I fear Eros himself, I desire to wash out the salt water from ears with dialogue's fresh water" (Τοῦτόν γε τοίνυν ἔγωγε αἰσχυνόμενος, καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Ἔρωτα δεδιώς, ἐπιθυμῶ ποτίμῳ λόγῳ οἷον ἁλμυρὰν ἀκοὴν ἀποκλύσασθαι·). Horace includes extended nautical metaphors in his overtures to re/cantation (*C.* I.5; 14). Socrates begins his palinode in defense of Eros and the lover with the argument that madness in the person of inspired priestesses, like the Pythia, brings many benefits to Greece (244a–e). Madness on the part of a lover need not be harmful. Horace starts his *de ira* also with divine inspiration, including the Pythian priestess, but alters the exemplum so that anger is the more powerful and destructive force (… *non adytis quatit* / *mentem sacerdotum incola Pythiis*, 16.5–6).

> Οὔ τι ὑπό γε Λυσίου, οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ σοῦ λόγου, ὃς διὰ τοῦ ἐμοῦ στόματος καταφαρμακευθέντος ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐλέχθη. εἰ δ' ἔστιν, ὥσπερ οὖν ἔστι, θεὸς ἤ τι θεῖον ὁ Ἔρως, οὐδὲν ἂν κακὸν εἴη, τὼ δὲ λόγω τὼ νυνδὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰπέτην ὡς τοιούτου ὄντος· ταύτῃ τε οὖν ἡμαρτανέτην περὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα, ἔτι τε ἡ εὐήθεια αὐτοῖν πάνυ ἀστεία, τὸ μηδὲν ὑγιὲς λέγοντε μηδὲ ἀληθὲς σεμνύνεσθαι ὡς τὶ ὄντε, εἰ ἄρα ἀνθρωπίσκους τινὰς ἐξαπατήσαντε εὐδοκιμήσετον ἐν αὐτοῖς. ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν, ὦ φίλε, καθήρασθαι ἀνάγκη· ἔστιν δὲ τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι περὶ μυθολογίαν καθαρμὸς ἀρχαῖος, ὃν Ὅμηρος μὲν οὐκ ᾔσθετο, Στησίχορος δέ.
>
> ἐγὼ οὖν σοφώτερος ἐκείνων γενήσομαι κατ' αὐτό γε τοῦτο· πρὶν γάρ τι παθεῖν διὰ τὴν τοῦ Ἔρωτος κακηγορίαν πειράσομαι αὐτῷ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν παλινῳδίαν, γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ τότε ὑπ' αἰσχύνης ἐγκεκαλυμμένος. (242d11–243a5; 243b3–7)
>
> [Yes, Aphrodite and her son are said to be gods,] but not by Lysias and not by your speech, which was spoken by you, using my mouth that you enchanted. If Eros is, as to be sure he is, a god or some divine entity, he could not be evil in any respect, but both speeches just now said he was exactly that; by saying this then, both sinned against Eros, and their sophistication was nothing more than silliness, because while they were not saying anything fit and true, they paraded around as though they really were something, looking to cheat and be respected by pretenders. I, in contrast, must cleanse myself, and for those sinning against mythology there is an ancient mode of purification not known to Homer but to Stesichorus.
>
> Therefore, I will prove myself wiser than both in precisely this way: before I am punished for slandering Love, I will try to make restitution to him with a palinode, my head bare and not covered out of shame as before.

Phaedrus performs for Socrates a reading of the rhetorician Lysias' speech on love (230e–234c) and then elicits a competing imitation from the philosopher, some perfectly innocent amusement between friends (237b–241d). The dramatic *krisis* comes when Socrates' speechifying replicates Phaedrus'/Lysias' misstatements about Aphrodite and her son, Eros. Socrates claims that all three in the speeches, which they passed on to each other, denied the gods' divinity. He judges the logic in the speeches flawed and ritually impure (ταύτῃ τε οὖν ἡμαρτανέτην περὶ τὸν Ἔρωτα), when they conclude that, because lovers treat their beloved with jealousy and hostility over the smallest of matters and are generally mad with passion, those not in love must be better off in their relationships than those in love (227c; 243c–d). Aphrodite and Eros, therefore, induce humans to harmful actions. Such an argument, in Socrates' estimation, charges divine beings with wrongful conduct, and

therefore denies their purity and consequently their divinity. Socrates goes so far as to punctuate his speech with some very iambic sounding criticism against love: "As wolves love lambs, so lovers feel affection for their beloved" (ὡς λύκοι ἄρνας ἀγαπῶσιν, ὣς παῖδα φιλοῦσιν ἐρασταί., 241d1).

Lysias and Phaedrus through their competitive display of speeches put their words against love into Socrates' mouth (ὃς διὰ τοῦ ἐμοῦ στόματος καταφαρμακευθέντος ὑπὸ σοῦ ἐλέχθη) and so stain him (ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν, ὦ φίλε, καθήρασθαι ἀνάγκη) that he insists he must construct a palinode (244a–257b), that is, he must answer back in favor of the lover in order to be cleansed (αὐτῷ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν παλινῳδίαν). Socrates uses, then, the example of Stesichorus to lighten the mood with a legendary anecdote, while still introducing a serious correction intended to entice Phaedrus away from the pretentious craftiness of rhetorical display to *paideia* through discourse (257b). Socrates' palinode for love is in the spirit of and leads into dialectic (258b–278b), so that his vision of love becomes an extension of his view on words. The dialogue form consists in an interchange of words and ideas, prompting the soul to remember the eternal forms, such as pure beauty. When speech promotes only the self, even when it ends in acquiescence not dispute, it has the potential to contaminate all those involved equally, but dialogue, resolving itself in mutual agreement, symbolizes what love should be ("I am a lover, Phaedrus, of the method which divides and brings together in order to produce reasoning and sound thought:" τούτων δὴ ἔγωγε αὐτός τε ἐραστής, ὦ Φαῖδρε, τῶν διαιρέσεων καὶ συναγωγῶν, ἵνα οἷός τε ὦ λέγειν τε καὶ φρονεῖν·, 266b3–5).[64] Socrates insists that true love is of a higher sort than the wrangling often mistaken for love. There must be mutuality between lover and beloved (243c, 245b, 253b, 255b–d,

---

[64] Despite Derrida's defense in *Plato's Pharmacy* (1968: 66–67), debates on the unity of the *Phaedrus* continue, especially on how the extended section on rhetoric fits with the whole (see Beare, 1913: 312–334; Hembold and Holther, 1952: 387–414; Plass, 1968: 7–38; the conversations between Heath, 1989: 151–173, 189–191, and Rowe, 1989: 175–188; Waterfield, 2002: xliv–xlix). I suggest that rhetoric fails because it (like the non-lover) is too much of a solo performance. The speeches on Love deserve censure because they are too much like set rhetorical speeches (228d–e: Socrates demands that Lysias' speech be read word for word; Phaedrus does not think that anyone could add anything to Lysias' speech, 234d–235b) and not actually dialectic at all. The miscellaneous quality of the *Phaedrus* is the point: philosophy is a performance of the whole, a varied conversation that recollects the unity of the forms. Writing also is deficient, if it disallows responsion (275d–e). In some degree Horace is performing in his re/cantation what Plato performs in his dialectic. Song without responsion [συμπλοκή] is deficient.

256a–d, 279b–c). Thus, Socrates' expectations for words and love (both dialectics) within the context of his palinode are on par with Horace's own re/cantation (*dum mihi / … animumque reddas.*, 16.26b–28), in which singing back, a literal sharing of song, reconstitutes relationship (you and I) beyond the divide created by the power dynamics of rage (I versus you).

C. I.16, commonly titled *Palinode* in translations and commentaries,[65] is only Horace's formal declaration and the culmination of an on-going poetic process: representing iambic with lyric as modes of responsion. Horace has been tutoring the potential power of reciprocal song over adversity throughout the *Epodes*, when he addresses Maecenas as friend (epode 1), exchanges some banquet banter with him (epode 3), and looks forward to a drinking-party at Maecenas' palace (epode 9). Horace can imagine his fellow citizens sailing with him to the Isles of the Blessed, where friendship extends to the animal world around them (*grex amicus*, epode 16.50). When we look beyond Canidia's last hate-filled words and consider the sudden shifts in and out of invective in the second half of the *Epodes*, then Horace never stops singing back. He has been *recanting* "singing back again" all along to such an extent that epode 17 is a duet between himself and Canidia. Latent in the generic complexity and intertexts of the *Epodes*, even in the act of Horace and Canidia talking back to one another—and he is not done answering her yet—was the association of iambic with the lyric mode through their capacity for "socializing" unequal elements (*verba loquor socianda chordis*, *C.* IV.9.4). Horatian iambic-lyric subsumes rage into the pleasure of shared experience (complicity) in song. This proves the counter-spell by which Horace first takes in and then overrules the antipathy at the root of the Archilochean-Lykambid view of iambic.

Horace's re/cantation (c.16) does not constitute a weak re/symbiosis. He literally re-sings one after another the primary arguments and threats that Canidia used to justify sustaining her rage (epode 17.54–75). She

[65] The title "Palinode" for c.16 is prevalent in the earlier secondary literature going back to the scholiasts and the manuscript titles (e.g., PALINODIA [variously addressed] γ δ λ π *z F* λ[1] Keller and Holder, 1899: ad loc.; Porph., ad loc.: "Hac ode παλινω⟨ι⟩δίαν repromittit ei;" Comm. Cruq., "Cantat palinodiam;" Bentley, 1711: ad loc.). When I hesitate to title c.16 *Palinode*, I am not arguing "palinode" is irrelevant for the ode's form and content. I am just not convinced Horace meant *recanto* to be a simple one-for-one translation (*supra*). Horace's re/cantation contains a *dissuasio* on anger (N.-H., 1970: 202–203), but in its interaction with Stesichorus and epode 17 it also fully recants (sings back again) through the tradition to realize a positive prescription for rage by correlating competing voices. Horace's *recanto* is more than a synonym for "retraction."

declared Horace would learn that she heard his pleas less than the cliff-walls heard shipwrecked sailors (*non saxa nudis surdiora navitis / Neptunus alto tundit hibernus salo*, 54–55).[66] Tantalus, the father of Pelops, craved for a respite from his frustrated desire. Prometheus longed for release and stayed chained (*optat quietem Pelopis infidi pater / egens benignae Tantalus semper dapis, / optat Prometheus obligatus aliti*, 65–67). Jove's laws forbade the commuting of Sisyphus' sentence (*optat supremo collocare Sisyphus / in monte saxum; sed vetant leges Iovis.*, 68–69). There would likewise be no pardon for Horace. Canidia promised him so much pain that he would welcome suicide with the Noric sword (*voles … / modo ense pectus Norico recludere*, 70–71); she would ride in triumph on his shoulders, while the earth cowered before her pride (*vectabor umeris tunc ego inimicis eques / meaeque terra cedet insolentiae*, 74–75).[67] Canidia's repetitive iambic spell (*optat … optat … optat … voles … vectabor*, the lead-off verbs, 65–74) declares that, while others fail to resist her power and so desire to destroy themselves to escape her, she is safe to revel in the conquests of her rage. She measures her supremacy by the enjoyment gained from the suffering she inflicts. Canidia *incants* anger for her own domination and exempts herself from its peril.

Horace *recants* Canidia's song so that his *de ira* affirms the power of rage, but universalizes the witch's threats: the Noric sword, shipwreck, and Jupiter's laws of judgment will never frighten off anger at all (… *quas [iras] neque Noricus / deterret ensis nec mare naufragum / nec … / Iuppiter ipse*, 16.9–12a). Anger is not anyone's sole possession; it afflicts everyone alike. Horace then emends in reverse order Canidia's mythic exempla, making everyone subject to anger's bestial terror. Canidia's Prometheus endured punishment (17.67); Horace's Prometheus places the lion's rage in every human (16.13–16).[68] Canidia cautioned Horace with the story of Tantalus, sentenced to suffer endless desire (17.65–66). In Horace rage descends through Tantalus' son Pelops to his grandchildren, Atreus and

---

[66] S.B. prints Palmer's "albo" (1891: 142) and cites Hom. *Il.* 15.618 ff. The reading of the manuscripts [*alto*] replicates better through the repeated "t" the smashing of the waves on the rocks (*Neptunus alto tundit* …); n.b. "albo" is the last in a list that Palmer introduces reluctantly, "The following conjectures may be worth recording though scarcely worth contending for."

[67] *Terra* (codices) is preferable to Campbell's "turba" (1945). See the discussion of this text (epode 17) in Chapter 4.

[68] There is no exact surviving parallel for Horace's account on how Prometheus created man (compare, N.-H., 1970: ad v.13, s.v. Prometheus); see *supra*. His word-choice has a Lucretian flair (*addere principi … coactus particulam undique*, 16.13b–14).

Thyestes (16.17–18). Thyestes seduced his brother's, Atreus', wife, and, as the two acted out their anger in a sequence of escalating revenge, Atreus cooked up his brother's children and fed them to him. The cycle of rage through Horace's myth-making runs rampant like animals, which once starved slaughter family, friend, and foe alike. No one is immune. Whereas Canidia trumpeted her exultant pride, *insolens* (17.75), Horace gives the word a decidedly negative connotation (c.16.21). Twice before he associated insolence with a victor oblivious to peril. Carthage and Hannibal fell to Rome and Rome in her turn, overtaken by her own success and decimated by civil wars, would fall to a foreigner haughty enough to defile Romulus' bones (*barbarus . . . insolens*, epode 16.11–14). Pyrrha had a new lover so seduced by her charms that he could not see he would end up just like her old lovers, abandoned (*emirabitur insolens*, *C.* I.5.8). Horace now ends his *de ira* with a tale of cities prospering at first but succumbing to the power of rage, which he personifies in the hostile army (*insolens*) plowing over the city walls. The lesson is clear. Only the arrogant (*insolens*) imagine that they can defy rage's vicious cycle and exploit it for their own benefit without the risk of infecting themselves or being destroyed by another. Anger, therefore, is not a safe tool to be used in gaining vengeance or as punishment, but is itself the primal cause of ruin. Paradoxically Horace lets retaliatory anger loose on a broader scale than Canidia, and in doing so convinces that for the benefit of all it should be resisted (*compesce mentem*, 22). This conclusion is all the more persuasive, because it occurs in the context of Horace illustrating the mechanism for overruling the division that can result from hard words. He re/sings Canidia's own exempla and words to free rage from her control. This strategy is symptomatic of Horace's iambic criticism. It is engaging Canidia and managing a responsion with her that creates the space for the mollification of anger. Also responsion in Horatian iambic cannot be equated simply with retaliation, since the former rejects a *telos* of pain and domination.

The universality within Horace's *de ira* reflects his first invitation to his addressees in the song's opening verses, perfectly designed to introduce the complicity around which he centers his revision of "attacking iambics" (*criminosis . . . iambis*, 2–3). First, he chooses to leave the recipient(s) of his re/cantation unnamed (*O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*), and since the first words of a song were commonly taken as the title, the re/cantation from its inception sounds both formal and discreet. On the other hand, as poets know, pseudonyms and anonymity can create a buzz about identity:

Nos facimus placitae late praeconia formae:
nomen habet Nemesis, Cynthia nomen habet:
Vesper et Eoae novere Lycorida terrae:
et multi, quae sit nostra Corinna, rogant. (Ov. *A.A.* 3.535–538)

I am the town crier of my beloved's beauty afar. Nemesis' name is renowned; Cynthia's name renowned. The West and the East have heard of Lycoris, and many ask who my Corinna is.

Secrecy begs a town to gossip, and on c.16 there is plenty.[69] Who is this daughter and mother? "O daughter, prettier still than her pretty mother" suits Leto and Helen, and therefore could be Horace's direct imitation of a lost first verse from Stesichorus' *Palinode*.[70] The parallels between epode 17 and odes 16 and 17 suggest Canidia and her daughter Tyndaris.[71] Horace from the start of this lyric operates beyond certitude. His title encourages curiosity and speculation, opening up the possibility for various interpretations, determined not just by the author but also by the audience's inclinations. The result is complicity (author, addressees, remote audience).

[69] Callimachus' address to a sexually abusive schoolteacher safeguards his identity (*Iamb.* 5: ὦ ξεῖνε, "o friend"). The digete names either Apollonius or Cleon, but there is no way to know for sure. Anonymity can protect. So can specificity to another degree. When Aristophanes names those he lampoons, most persons are laughing at the other. On the other hand, Theophrastus sketches his *Characters*, types without names, and so the laughter could be aimed at you. Withholding names or using pseudonyms does not clarify the speaker's intentions: anger or concern, maybe both. To be sure, anonymity provokes curiosity, and it also allows impersonation. One girl boasted all around town that she was Corinna (Ov. *Am.* 2.17.29–30). Sane addressees of a Lykambid iambic invective would not do this, nor would they complain about not being named.

[70] Ritter (1856: ad loc.) is the first to make what becomes a general assumption. In Ritter's favor, Horace starts songs with variations of borrowed lines (e.g., *C.* I.9.1–8 [Alc. 338 L.-P.]; 12.1–3 [Pi. *O.* 2.1–4]; 18.1 [Alc. 342 L.-P.]; 37.1 [Alc. 332 L.-P.]; II.18.1–2 [B. fr. 28 *PLG*]; III.12.1 [Alc. 10 L.-P.]; IV.4.1–4 [Pi. *P.* 1.1–12]; 15.1–4 [Call. *Aetia* fr. 1.21–24 Pf., Verg. *Ecl.* 6.3–9a]). The association of the verse with Helen is helped by the preceding ode that assigns blame to Paris (*Pastor cum traheret per freta navibus / Idaeis Helenen perfidus hospitam*, 15.1–2; cf. Griffiths, 2002: 69); compare Helen at *C.* IV.9.13–16a: *non sola comptos arsit adulteri / crinis … / mirata regalisque cultus / et comites.*

[71] The identification Canidia/Gratidia and/or Tyndaris dates to the scholiasts and manuscript titles: Porph. and Ps.-Acro: ad loc.; T[i]yndaris *A B C D a u*; Canidia *R*; G[C]ratidia γ δ π *z* (Cruq.); G[C]ratidia vel T[i]yndaris *F* λ^1 (Keller and Holder, 1899: ad loc.). Frank (1936: 159–162), while defending his fanciful guess, Canidia = Clodia's daughter, Caecilia Metella, provides a helpful summary of the various identifications (see also Hahn, 1939: 215); cf. Fraenkel's rebuttal (1957: 63 n. 1, 207–209). Most, who attempt to name the nameless, settle on Tyndaris: *filia pulchrior*. A recantation, imitating Stesichorus' *Palinode* to Helen and addressed to a daughter named Tyndaris, is too much epic coincidence for some to pass up, especially when the recantation comes between c.15 on Paris and Helen and c.17 addressed to a Tyndaris, who will sing about Circe's and

Second, it is Horace's habit in the *Odes* to name his addressees.[72] He admits more generic addresses in the *Epodes*, which immediately invites comparison between c.16 and his previous iambic structures. Horace wastes no time; without mentioning names he takes up again his re/cantation right at the point of attack he used to blame and trap Canidia. The witch faked being a mother to disguise her identity (epode 5.6–7; 17.49–52).[73] Horace now offers a different outlook on the mother-daughter relationship: a mother and her more beautiful child together form a genetic strand that sets birth and renewal above atrophy and death. The re/cantation with its first verse reverses the destructive loop of aggression, retaliation, counter-retaliation. More important than the exact names of the addressees, the reversal that they personify resonates through the song's whole structure, contrasting white against black with the revenge rich dynastic catastrophe of Tantalus—Pelops—Thyestes—Atreus. Horace's iambic-lyric sings back through Canidia all the way to the House of Atreus. This contrast of mother / daughter—father / son / brothers announces a partnership by natural law in which mother and daughter, two of a kind yet uniquely different, share in each other's most perfect beauty. Complicity engenders regeneration: beautiful mother, more beautiful daughter.[74]

Penelope's fight for Odysseus' affections (cf. K.-H., 1930³: *praef.* c.16; Santirocco, 1986: 49–52; Griffiths, 2002: 68–69; Putnam, 2006: 74–75). To complicate the matter, there are the connections between Horace's earlier palinode to Canidia, epode 17, and c.16 and c.17 (Hahn, 1939: 224–229). If Tyndaris' mother is Canidia, suggested by Sturtevant (1912: 119–122), then she would have at least two children, Pactumeius and Tyndaris (Hahn, 229, takes the plurals, *liberos*, *partubus*, and the frequentative *utcumque* very literally, epode 5.5, 17.52). I find the precise identities in this case incidental to the question of why Horace leaves the addressees unnamed, when this is against his practice in the *Odes* (see the following note).

[72] Horace assigns names to his addressees in the *Odes*: the notable exception being slaves (*pueri*, I.19.14; *puer*, I.38.1; cf. Thaliarchus, I.9.8). In his more admonitory lyrics (against excess, for instance), he uses the general second person (II.15; III.24) or first person (II.18). In erotic lyrics, even when Horace directs the poem to an unspecified Muse, servants, or suitor, he names the love interest (I.19 [Glycera]; I.26 [Lamia]; II.5 [Lalage]). *C.* I.16 is the only time in the *Odes* that Horace does not assign a name to the love interest. Also unique is Horace's sympotic invitation to an unnamed antiquarian (III.19). Lyric by Horatian instinct is not an anonymous mode.

[73] For the bibliography surrounding the debate on mother Canidia, see epodes 5 and 17 in Chapters 2 and 4 respectively.

[74] If the mother could be Canidia, Horace with his lyre plays the ultimate trick. If Canidia accepts the compliment for her daughter, then she cannot be all hardness and self-seeking rage. Horace finds room to appeal to her softer side (*tibi hospitale pectus et purae manus*, epode 17.49).

The complicity conveyed in the address governs the remainder of the song. It is so complete that Horace hides whose iambs are to be thrown away his and/or the woman's. Conveniently *iambi* is left without a particular possessive, mine or yours. No doubt Horace wrote *iambi* that offended the woman (he admits as much, vv.22–25), but he speaks to her as though she could now be angered herself and preparing to retaliate, which could include composing her own verbal attacks against him.[75] He leaves out all details as to who started what in their fight, commenting merely that whatever insults were made went beyond rightful limits

[75] MacKay (1962: 298–300) and Dyson (1968:169–179), followed by Connor (1987: 79–80) and more tentatively Davis (1991: 76), insist on "her" attacks. MacKay reads *pones* (v.3) as a deferential request ("you will I am sure" throw away), which means that the iambi are most likely hers. The singer follows up the command for restraint (*compesce mentem*) with an unexpected *quoque* (22). "Also" means that his command is directed at her (K.-H. 1884/1958: n.22) and implies that she too wrote iambs. The proviso clause then suggests that he will only give in, if she recants the insults. This particular interpretation of the circumstances has done little to reverse the instinct that in a palinode the author is the one who offended (cf. Cat. 36; Santirocco, 1986: 50–51, 195, n.26; Jenkyns, 1982: 146, n.1; West, 1995: 78; Putnam, 2006: 74, 81–82). Besides, the speaker is conciliatory from the opening verse. When he admits that he wrote *iambi* as a young man, the reader cannot help but think of the *Epodes*. What is clear, however, is that the speaker acknowledges the woman's anger and marks it as an emotion she should dismiss (Commager, 1962:138; Williams, 1980: 1–5; Murgatroyd, 1982: 238–239). The speaker's admonitory tone in the extended *de ira* and recantation ("only if you first return your affection") led N.-H. (1970: 202–203; followed by Harris, 2001: 270, n.22) to conclude that the song could not rightly be called a palinode. Yet, it should not be surprising, looking back on the *Epodes*, if Horace represents iambic anger as a contagion that obfuscates the distinction between attacker and attacked: "Horace … was motivated by *ira* to write *iambi* … and the girl reacted with similar *ira* against Horace" (Cairns, 1978: 549–550). Horace also leaves the dramatic circumstances open enough to wonder whether the iambs were against the daughter, her mother, or both. Does "now" (*nunc*, 25) signify that he wrote the iambs in the past (presumably against the mother) and then stopped, and he is just coming around to disavow them, or does "now" pinpoint primarily a change of heart, that he wrote iambs against the daughter only and now is ready to make amends? Horace's song has more intrigue, if we allow it to stand as he wrote it, open-ended. Retaliatory rage (Achilochean-Lykambid style), that of the singer's youth and otherwise, is what he disavows. Strictly speaking it makes little difference whether Horace first insulted the mother or daughter. To insult one would be to insult the other, which assures that the mother and daughter share undivided loyalties. The daughter can forgive any past offenses against her mother. Their closeness also allows Horace a chance for a little romantic "tom-foolery." If Horace enjoyed an affair with the mother, he surely can pick it back up again with her daughter (*O matre pulchra filia pulchrior*, "a splendidly unabashed piece of risqué and risky flattery," Jenkyns, 1982: 149); Cairns (1978: 549): "As Horace reveals at the end of the ode with typical obliqueness, his real motive for recanting is that he wants to win the girl."

(*criminosis* … *iambis*, v.2–3).[76] This is the only time Horace uses the adjective *criminosus*, but his use of the corresponding noun at *C.* III.7.13–16 gives a good indication of the intent. Proteus' wife falsely accused Bellerephon (*falsis* … *criminibus*, 14) to her husband, who then ordered his death. These iambs, then, were notably of the Lykambid variety, meant to inflict suffering. He and she gave in to the natural impulse to rage, and yet as much as anger belongs to all of humanity so Horace assigns to both the woman and himself control over such iambics. She can place limits on them as she wills (*quem* … *cumque voles modum*, 2). He orders her to show restraint (*compesce mentem*, 22), which would only be to follow his example.

The entire Palinode is in essence an invitation, and Horace formulates the closing so that the singer and addressee are totally dependent on each other (re/cantation: *ego* … *dum* … *fias* … *reddas*, 25b–28). The move from anger to gentility, as well argued as it may be in the *de ira*, is predicated on each adopting the spirit of complicity … "only if" (*dum*), placed at the middle of the appeal. The conclusion balances the outcome of the entire song on call-response. The two will either stay in anger or leave it together. She is given the chance to answer back with a corresponding song. The request Horace makes of her participates in a language of mutuality that he reserves for a select few (*mihi / fias recantatis* ***amica*** */ opprobriis* ***animumque*** *reddas*, 26b–28). The poet's patron-friend, Maecenas, sailed away into battle (*Ibis* … */* ***amice***, epode 1.1–2a; *Maecenas*, … */ o et praesidium et dulce decus meum*, *C.* I.1–2). Horace prays the ship to bring back safely his friend Vergil, half of his own soul (***reddas*** *incolumem precor / et serves* ***animae*** *dimidium meae.*, *C.* I.3.7–8). He will not suffer separation from Maecenas even in death; to do so would be to lose part of himself (*nec dis* ***amicum*** *est nec mihi te prius / obire, Maecenas, mearum / grande decus columenque rerum. / a, te meae si partem* ***animae*** *rapit / maturior vis*, *C.* II.17.2–6a). Note, in particular, the parallel in the songs Horace and Phyllis will sing to each other to celebrate Maecenas' birthday and drive away death's cares (*condisce modos amanda / voce quos* ***reddas***; *minuentur atrae / carmine curae*, *C.* IV.11.34b–36). The gifts (wine and song) exchanged with Vergil have the power to give new hope (*spes donare novas largus amaraque / curarum eluere efficax*,

[76] Cf. Liv. 8.12.14: *dictatura popularis et orationibus in patres criminosis fuit*; Suet. *Caes.* 75.5.5: *Aulique Caecinae criminosissimo libro et Pitholai carminibus maledicentissimis laceratam existimationem suam civili animo tulit.*

C. IV.12.19–20).[77] Above all what makes this particular appeal (c.16) so persuasive is that Horace neither denies anger's power nor surrenders to it. He is able to sing from antipathy (retaliatory iambic) to complicity, and beckons his beloved to add her song to his.

P.S. Tyndaris (C. I.17)

P.S. Tyndaris[78]—the fiery heat of the Dog Star has left, the smelly he-goats' mates enjoy their pasturage, and the little goats do not fear snakes and wolves:

> Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem
> mutare Lycaeo Faunus et igneam
> defendit aestatem capellis
> usque meis pluviosque ventos.

[77] Also Horace and Lyde's reciprocal song invites Aphrodite into their night (*nos cantabimus invicem … dicetur merita Nox quoque nenia*, *C.* III.28.9–16). Compare *C.* IV.1.29–32, where Horace attempts to distance himself from his previous lyrics by claiming that he no longer expects that he will enjoy a mutual affection (*iam nec spes animi credula mutui*, 30; cp. *carpe diem*, *quam minimum credula postero*, *C.* I.11.8b).

[78] My P.S. imitates Griffiths (2002: 69): "To sum up, 16 is the overture to the performance of 17." The long-standing inclination (back to the scholiasts) to read 16 and 17 together is based on three arguments (K.-H., 1930^3: *praef.* c.16; Sturtevant, 1912: 121–122; Hahn, 1939: 223–230; Collinge, 1961: 46–47; Santirocco, 1986: 50–52; Griffiths, 2002: 67–70; Putnam, 2006: 75–88, n.b. 75). (1) As mentioned above, an address to Tyndaris follows naturally after a recantation recalling Stesichorus' *Palinode* to Helen. Horace reminds his audience of Helen's circumstances by inviting Tyndaris to sing about the erotic labors of Circe and Penelope (*dices laborantis in uno / Penelopen vitreamque Circen*, 17.19–20). (2) The two odes are thematic complements: c.16 offers reconciliation to love and c.17 adds an invitation to love-making. The motif of exchange that closes c.16 opens c.17 (*… nunc ego mitibus / mutare quaero tristia*, 25–26b; *Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem / mutat Lycaeo Faunus*, 1–2a). (3) Horace avoids consecutive odes in the same meter without some connection between the two songs (see Sturtevant, 1912: 121–122). This approach is not unanimous (Wickham, 1874: *praef.* c.16; Fraenkel, 1957: 207–209, devotes his entire discussion of the ode to refuting any interdependence; Syndikus, 1972: 180 n.1). Why would Horace leave the addressees of c.16 anonymous and then blatantly give away a name in the next ode? Fraenkel insists that associating the two odes violates Buttmann's dictum (1828: *appendix*) that each ode is a self-contained interpretive unit (Fraenkel: 208 n.3; cf. Jenkyn's counter, 1982: n.7). There is room for some balance between Fraenkel ("every Horatian ode is self-contained") and Griffiths ("… they jointly constitute a unity and should be thought of as together forming a single poem."). Lyric as stand-alone short poems does not preclude a skilled artist creating and sustaining thematic movements in a poetry book. *Filia pulchrior* does not have to be Tyndaris for c.16 to be a prelude for 17 (Santirocco, 1986: 51).

impune tutum per nemus arbutos
quaerunt latentis et thyma deviae
olentis uxores mariti,
nec viridis metuunt colubras

nec Martialis haediliae lupos,
utcumque dulci, Tyndari, fistula
valles et Usticae cubantis
levia personuere saxa. (*C.* I.17.1–12)

Faunus swift often leaves Lycaeus for charming Lucretilis and keeps always the fiery heat and the rainy gales away from my she-goats. Mates of the stinking billy goat, they, wandering safe and sound through the grove, search out the hiding strawberries and thyme. And their kids fear neither green snakes nor the wolves of Mars, whenever, Tyndaris, Ustica's sloping vale and her smooth rocks resound with the sweet pipe.

Horace, as in c.1, transforms the idyllic into the tangible and credible. The utopian landscape, a dream for Alfius, epode 2, and the war weary Romans, epode 16, exists (*aut* ***in reducta valle*** *mugientium / prospectat errantis greges*, 2.11–12; … *credula nec ravos timeant armenta leones … mella cava manant ex ilice … nullius astri / gregem aestuosa torret impotentia*, 16.33–62; *hic tibi copia / manabit … hic* ***in reducta valle*** *Caniculae / vitabis aestus*, c.17.14b–17a), and the repeated deictic fixes it in a specific time and locale (*hic … hic … hic*, c.17.14–21): Horace's own backyard, his farm given to him by his friend Maecenas (cf. epode 1.25–32).[79] Horace is not describing an imaginary pastoral wonder-world; just the opposite, he is making the extraordinary real and accessible, and claiming that it is his particular domain.[80] Pan has become the Roman Faunus and moved from Greek Arcadia (Mount Lycaeus) to Horace's Sabine home (Mount Lucretilis). Tyndaris can escape and enjoy herself "right here."

The *symphysis* of landscape, music, and eroticism aligns with the presentation of iambic as an act of responsion, and reinforces the metapoetic metaphor in c.17. Horace, as in c.16, is calming the intemperate and violent with the power to share song. Tyndaris, under the lush protection of Horace's sheltered vale, his piety and his Muse, has the opportunity to pick up the lyre and sing for the singer. The sloping valley and her smooth

[79] It is worth repeating that Horace is a genius at first words. "Swift charming often Lucretilis" (*Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem*, 1) encapsulates the whole lyric. Horace's description of his land reflects Sappho's keen sense of place expressed in her δεῦρύ μ' ἐκ Κρήτας, fr. 2 L.-P; cf. Jenkyns (1982b: 38).

[80] Compare Commager, 1962: 350–351.

rocks (sexual imagery intended) will resound together with pipe, voice, and lyre. She can here and now become the symposiast under the power of Bacchus not Mars (epode 2.19–28; c.17.19–24) and sing of Penelope and Circe contending for Odysseus' love. The iambist sang of Circe in his plea for Canidia to cease and desist (epode 17). Tyndaris will pick up that strain and her rendition of Penelope's and Circe's competition has the potential to provide respite (13–24a):

di me tuentur. dis pietas mea
et Musa cordi est. hic tibi copia
manabit ad plenum benigno
ruris honorum opulenta cornu.

hic in reducta valle Caniculae
vitabis aestus et fide Teia
dices laborantis in uno
Penelopen vitreamque Circen.

hic innocentis pocula Lesbii
duces sub umbra, nec Semeleius
cum Marte confundet Thyoneus
proelia …

The gods watch over me. My piety and Muse please the gods. Here for you from the splendor of the field will flow a rich abundance to the full from bountiful horn. Here in the valley's recess you will escape the Dog Star's heat, and playing on Teian lyre you will sing of Penelope and glimmering Circe contesting for the same lover. Here under the shade you will enjoy cups of mild Lesbian wine, nor will Thyoneus, Semele's son, and Mars start a mêlée.

As different as c.17 is in tone and circumstances from c.16, it re/sings to Tyndaris an invitation similar to the conditional conclusion of c.16. Like the beautiful daughter, Horace gives Tyndaris a choice between his participatory harmonies and the enraged violence typifying the Archilochean-Lykambid tradition, here personified in the forced submission demanded from Tyndaris by the bestial Cyrus grabbing for his sex (17.24–28). Tyndaris, so to speak, stands on the threshold between two competing realities. Under the auspices of Horace's song, the poetic landscape has changed (… *mitibus / mutare* … *tristia*, 16.25–26a; *Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem / mutat Lycaeo Faunus*, 17.1–2b). In the complicity of iambic-lyric discourse there is power to shake loose from Canidia and Cyrus (epode 17 and c.17), antipathy and strife. Tyndaris would be a fool to refuse to sing and return to her past lover, as much as the beautiful daughter would lose out by holding on to anger. Horace's invi-

tations to both argue that it is shared song, the polyphony it displays and the pleasure it engenders, which teaches how to move past rage's monolithic and entrenched division.

Summation

The trend to identify a deep coherence within the *Epodes* is recent, and in some respects for good reason.[81] Horace writes epodes 1–10 all in iambic couplets, but from 11–17 he rapidly alternates meter from one epode to the next except for epodes 14 and 15, both pythiambic[1]. This is not to mention the constant and rapid shifting in characters, themes, and tones, which David Porter, himself a proponent of a linear reading, labels "jarring" (1995: 108). Furthermore, the second half of the book moves backwards: the triumphant celebration for Octavian's victory at Actium (epode 9) comes before the "pessimistic" epodes 16 and 17. One could say that Horace's *Epodes* snatches defeat from the jaws of victory. Given this high degree of structural *variatio*, any argument for coherence must recognize the value of polyphony and attempt to account for its consequences.

First, the value of Horace's iambic is in the transitions, as well as the corresponding "back and forth," the responsions the transitions create. When Demeter crosses into Metanaira's home, right before the goddess meets Iambe, she steps on the threshold. The threshold is not a place of clear distinctions, like a before and after picture. It is an in-between-moment poised on the brink of various possibilities. It is the one place where such designators as "inside" and "outside" remain unclear. Horatian iambic, likewise, is song that exists within the tensions between competing realities. It does not fixate exclusively on anger, repression, or release, but simultaneously contains and negotiates between such opposing potentialities, which makes it a perfect vehicle to communicate the uncertain social situation in which Horace at the time was writing and the Romans were living.

Second, Horace's sophisticated polyphonic approach represents iambic as much more than a weapon for vengeance and/or forced compliance. To state the case in the negative—partisan is not an adequate

[81] On the Epode's *polyeideia*, see the Introduction and Chapter 3. Compare, for example, "the book of the *Epodes* is rather a jumble" (Campbell, 1924: 135); [the *Epodes* is] "heterogeneous like no other collection in classical literature" (Shackleton Bailey, 1982: 8–9).

descriptor for Horace's iambic project. Instead, it presents a discourse so multivalent that it defuses rather than sustains the one-sided mindset evident in warring and social division. Consequently, Horace's audience participates in what amounts to a catharsis of anger, a process he consistently encodes into his iambic from his first to last. Epode 1 transitions from war (Actium) to comedy (the stock characters, the miser and the spendthrift). Horace begins epistle 19 enraged, on the attack against bad poets and critics, but in the end he calls for change, breaking off the argument with a teasing sports metaphor and a warning:

> 'displicet iste locus' clamo et diludia posco.
> ludus enim genuit trepidum certamen et iram,
> ira truces inimicitias et funebre bellum. (19.47–49)
>
> I shout, "That position you have is unfair," and I demand a change. For sport has produced terrifying strife and anger, anger has produced vicious enmity and deadly war.

This combination, conflict / mitigation, both on a smaller scale within the single poem and on a larger within and between collections (besides explaining why Horace in epistle 19 would so closely associate his iambic and lyric achievement) unties iambic from the Lykambid tradition and its uniform bias that reduces the genre to retaliatory invective (violation, invective, domination), so that Horace's overall approach ends up reflecting an archaic ritual paradigm, exemplified in the *Hymn to Demeter* and "Archilochus and the Cow" (transgression, responsion, fusion).[82] Horatian iambic in effect recovers for Rome both Archilochus and Callimachus but not as fixed and mutually exclusive iambic types—either an acceptance of unrestrained anger or a softening of invective. Both models together reveal the *polyeideia* within the whole of the iambic tradition, which allows Horace to set his iambic within a diverse social framework as a more complex poetic that acts out the halting and often agonizing process of learning through opposition the ability to comprehend and appreciate a diversified unity (*iambikē poiēsis*), a process he will replicate at the beginning and end of the *Ars Poetica* and define as the essential *telos* for poetry (Chapter 6).

---

[82] Specific definitions for each can be found in the Introduction.

CHAPTER SIX

CRITICAL PLURALITIES: *IAMBIKĒ POIĒSIS* IN THE START AND STOP OF THE *ARS POETICA*

The Critical "Older Horace"

Horace did not die "pen-in-hand." As far as we know his final work, whether *Odes* IV or one of the later epistles, stands complete. If the *Ars Poetica* was his last writing,[1] then he began this letter with a scene of an audience laughing at a bad painter (1–5), and his final three words, an invective against a poet gone mad, were "blood-engorged leech" (*plena cruoris hirudo*, 476). Horace's literary career ends where it began, with mockery and blame. This connection between his early and later career opens the door for comparison. To what end does Horace employ these final invectives, especially when they are the start and stop for his most concentrated and sustained statement on poetics? Is there any parallel with his iambic criticism, and what could this teach about how he formulates his literary criticism and would review his own poetic legacy? Brink contends (1963: 3–14) that the repetition within what he sees as the basic tripartite structure of the *Ars* (40–118; 119–294; 295–476) reflects

[1] N.b. "as far as we know" and "if." The dating of the *Ars* is caught in the dispute over which of the Calpurnii Pisones Horace addresses (*Pisones … pater et iuvenes patre digni*, 6, 24; *O maior iuvenum*, *quamvis et voce paterna / fingeris ad rectum et per te sapis, hoc tibi dictum / tolle memor*, 366–368a). A post *Odes* IV date is slightly more popular (see Dilke's, 1958: 49, listing of scholars and their preferred dates, ranging from 28–27 to 10–8 BC); for an overview of the arguments, compare Frischer, 1991: 52–97, and Armstrong, 1993: 190–215; cf. Brink, 1963: 239–243: the evidence only recommends either the *intervallum lyricum* (23–18 BC) or post *Odes* IV (14–8 BC). Bentley (1711: *praef.*, XXVI) states in general, "Postremo *Artem Poeticam* et *Epistolarum librum alterum*, annis incertis," and then more specifically and without explanation (ad v.387), "Quippe scripta est Epistola illa Ciceronis [*Fam.* VII,1] quadraginta prius annis, quam Ars haec Poetica," which would be 15 BC It has been suggested that the apparent absence of a definitive arrangement for the *Ars* indicates the letter was put together from unfinished pieces and published posthumously. This seems unlikely. The intricate and overlapping connections of the beginning and ending character portraits (bad painter / mad poet) with the middle (the proper techniques for poetic composition) are too close to the structural patterns within the *Odes* (cf. Tarrant, 1995: 33, on the *da capo* arrangement).

the conversational form of the *sermo*. Form is only part of the story. The *Ars* is *sermo* in both form and thought. The casting of blame at the opening and closing of the *Ars* signals the principal contrast between good and bad poetry, the unifying précis of the letter. Poor poetry fosters isolation. Poetry artfully done should be like a conversation, giving voice to and holding together often diverse elements into a concerted whole, and therefore good poetry, whatever form it takes, must be transgressive (able to cut across competing perspectives). At this juncture Horace's iambic and literary criticism intersect, revealing a single integrated Horatian/Augustan discourse designed to effect socio-political pluralities. *Sermo*, therefore, in this case the letter-form prone to be discursive and dialogic (it anticipates response), models well Horatian poetics.[2]

I would like to insert at this point a subsidiary question. Why is sharp criticism hard to accept from "our older" Horace? The question brings into focus some evidence and prejudice. Just as when Horace's admission that enraged speech could be dangerous seemed to support his criticism of Archilochus, so the older Horace induces us to view him as a tempered version of his younger self (*C.* II.4; IV.1; *Epist.* I.1.1–19; II.2.141–154), when on occasion he consigns anger/impatience to his youth (*C.* I.16;

[2] I will try to respect Horace's choice of the letter-form by framing my chapter more in the style of an essay. When I bypass such questions as the exact date for the letter or which of the Pisones it addresses, I am not implying that these concerns are extraneous. I leave them to others (see the helpful article by Armstrong, 1993; also Oliensis, 1998: 198–223), so that I can position the *Ars* better within the context of Horace's writings. Not breaking off the *Ars* from Horace's other song, as though it were a loose appendage on a statue or painted creature, aids in evaluating his claim that unity is the essential quality for fine poetry. All agree that the *Ars Poetica* differs from any other treatise on rhetoric or poetry (Rudd, 1989: 34; Lefèvre, 1993: 329–331; Hardison and Golden, 1995: 30–36; Maurach, 2001: 454). Horace does not use an obvious subject heading until two-thirds of the way though the letter (306–308), and then lists off enough subtopics that Brink titles the "section" loosely, "general questions of poetic criticism" (Brink, 1963: 13). Although all other section-markers (commonly 40–41, 153) are contested, Horace's poetry survived largely because the Middle Ages treated his *Ars* as a handbook; compare Kilpatrick, 1990: 34–36. There is no need repeating details found in Brink's *primus labor*. Attempts to reduce the *Ars* to a didactic treatise, and so subdivide it into clear-cut increments, lose momentum with Brink (1963: 249–259), which creates the chance to engage him at the point he defended the originality of his own work: "Clearly a fresh analysis of the *Ars Poetica* is required. It must ascertain one thing above all. Does the poem itself, without the assistance (or hindrance) of extraneous criteria, reveal any vestige of arrangement or plan?" (1963:4); cf. Armstrong's opening line (1993: 185): "Horace's *Ars Poetica* has a unique reputation among his poems; at once one of his most brilliantly and memorably written—every other line is a familiar tag—and the one that most baffles any effort to give a coherent account of its argument and structure."; also 190: "… an inner logic … still eludes us in the *Ars Poetica*'s case."

III.14). He can play this strategy to great effect, since it is a commonplace human profile—as we age we gradually stop "sowing our wild oats" and "settle down"—but his hard talk defeats expectations. Horatian lyric expresses anger and blame very effectively, and frequently, as in iambic, targets "aging" women (*C.* I.25; III.15: IV.13)—and there is more. Horace scatters pointed attacks throughout his *Odes* and directs it at a variety of persons, from jilted and jilting lovers (*C.* I.8; 25; II.8; III.10; IV.10; 13), to misers and spendthrifts (*C.* II.2; 14.25–28; 15; 18), to epic heroes (*C.* I.15), to warring enemies (*C.* I.37) and impious Romans (*C.* I.35.25–40; II.13; III.6; 24), to political elites (*C.* IV.9.45–52). These instances are not confined to his earliest lyrics, and the *Epistles* retain a strong satiric tone.

This wide distribution prevents his lyrics and later poetry from being conceived of as docile and pacified modes, and while these invectives are less frequent and modified so that they align thematically with the expectations of genre (such as cursing offending lovers in lyric or critics in unheroic hexameter verse), they unsettle because they come from the "post-war," the "old gentlemen," the "mentor," the "friend" Horace, an empathetic figure. The human impulse toward a milder Horace is so strong that there is a tendency to sidestep his jabs by transforming them into unoffending examples of irony, hyperbole, or drama for some kind of effect. The "younger" versus "older" Horace, however, is not a stable characterization, especially if it is politicized into "unaccomodated"/"accommodated." When this is done, Horace's career and poetics are pushed into too narrow a perspective (see the Introduction). He begins angry, while the civil wars rage on, and then smoothes out his poetry as he becomes accommodated to the Augustan peace and program. The maturing Horace gives up the satire/iambic of his younger days and turns to lyric, and when the old Horace returns to hexameter poetry, he writes his satire into the more congenial form of the epistle. Taking into account only the few examples outlined above, it becomes questionable whether Horace's later criticisms always align well with such a consistent caricature as the 'civil Mr. Horace.'[3]

---

[3] The 'civil Mr. Horace' is an accepted interpretive prejudice, although it runs counter to the logic of a particular poem. To cite a few examples: Horace could not be including Octavian among the *scelesti* (epode 7); the praise for Lollius does not contain overt criticism (*C.* IV.9); he would not call Vergil a *cliens* (*C.* IV.12); he is being sympathetic with the aging Lyce, because he too is growing older (*C.* IV.13). We seem to prefer our Horace tamed and taming; see Fowler's seminal discussion of twentieth century readings of Horace (1993: 269). A certain understanding of the Epicurean use of "frank speech"

This narrow matrix (civil wars as the basis for an iambic praxis) has limited relevancy for the *Ars Poetica*. Although the memory of war and loss fades slowly and the process of rebuilding Rome was ongoing, if any war is being fought in this epistle it can only be a literary one, and therefore metaphoric. Metaphor, however, does not make artistic conflict artificial, nor are the mockery and blame at the beginning and end of the *Ars* hyperbole without a point.[4] Criticism as practiced by Horace reflects the socio-historical concerns of a culture healing from civil conflict; nonetheless, it moves beyond this to insist that poetry regardless of type and circumstance is done best when it cuts across the differences that separate, no matter how dangerous and painful this process may be. In this sense, the *Ars Poetica* is at its core iambic-lyric, since it grounds its literary criticism in the necessity of bringing into discourse disparate entities, the artist in combination with audience, with critic, with society at large.

Horace centers the whole of his song around a common interest (*simplex dumtaxat et unum*, *Ars* 23), whether operating in the more critical modes of satire and iambic or the supposedly more agreeable forms of lyric and the epistle, and that concern is the leading role the poet plays in creating art, a *simplex* formed from competing interests

---

(παρρησία) also plays a role: "All reproof and admonition must be done with gentleness, kindliness, and courtesy. This injunction seems to have given a new vogue to Roman *suavitas*, for which, Atticus, among others, was noted, in contrast to the old-fashioned *asperitas*. This kindly tone, it may be observed, was with increasing consistency maintained by Horace as opposed to Lucilius. Epicureanism was making a distinct contribution to the European concept of a cultured gentleman" (De Witt, 1935: 313). More recently it is argued that Epicurean *parrhesia* envelops the tension between two poles, negative (ἐπίπληξις, "blame") and positive (νουθέτησις, "correction"); see Philodemus' Περὶ παρρησίας (Konstan 1988: "Introduction" by C.E. Glad). "Kindliness" in Epicurean thought does not omit stern rebuke, σκληρά (see Kilpatrick, 1996: 69–100); for further references and discussion, see the Introduction. Horace's Quintilius is the essential Epicurean critic (*Ars* 438–452): he demanded correction ('*corrige*' … *aiebat*, 438–439), based on camaraderie (*sodes*, 438) and designed to improve (*bis terque expertum frustra delere iubebat / et male tornatos incudi reddere versus*, 440–441), and he knew when to stop intervening (*nullum ultra verbum aut operam insumebat inanem, / quin sine rivali teque et tua solus amares*, 443–444). His criticism was an act of friendship (… *nec dicet 'cur ego amicum / offendam in nugis?' hae nugae seria ducent / in mala derisum semel exceptumque sinistre*, 450–452).

[4] Literary criticism is part of the iambic tradition. Hipponax aims his invective at artists: Bupalus, Athenis, and Mimnes. "The striking element here is that Hipponax faults all of these artists, directly or indirectly, for something each has done aesthetically wrong or in a displeasing manner. In other words, the poet presents himself as a critic of aesthetics" (Acosta-Hughes, 2002: 35). Hipponax would have enjoyed the beginning and end of Horace's *Ars Poetica*.

and expectations. Horace's literary criticism aligns with his iambic praxis because it depends on and constructs pluralities. Art cannot be a solo act. It follows that it is advisable for artists, who want to produce a truly praiseworthy work (in writing song as in daily living), to ignore seductive flatterers, playing to individualized ambitions, and to listen to the critic, preferably one like Quintilius (*Ars* 419–452):

> nolito ad versus tibi factos ducere plenum
> laetitiae: clambit enim 'pulchre! bene! recte!'
> pallescet super his, etiam stillabit amicis
> ex oculis rorem, saliet, tundet pede terram.
> ut qui conducti plorant in funere dicunt
> et faciunt prope plura dolentibus ex animo, sic
> *derisor* vero plus laudatore movetur. (427–433)

> Do not serve the verses you have composed to one full of merriment: for he will shout 'Beautiful!, Bravo!, Excellent!' He will grow pale over them, his fawning eyes will even grow misty, he will dance, he will stomp his foot on the ground. As paid mourners at a funeral say and do nearly more than those genuinely grieved, so the *mimic* is moved more than the one who is honest with his praise.[5]

Not every artist though can stand up to critical heat—before and after the "frank" Quintilius (*nuda Veritas*, *C.* I.24.7) come the bad painter and mad poet.

The Bad Painter and Mad Poet: Artistic and Social Fragmentation

> Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
> iungere si velit et varias inducere plumas
> undique collatis membris, ut turpiter atrum
> desinat in piscem mulier formosa superne,
> spectatum admissi risum teneatis, amici?
> credite, Pisones, isti tabulae fore librum
> persimilem cuius, velut aegri somnia, vanae
> fingentur species, ut nec pes nec caput uni
> reddatur formae. (1–9a)

[5] Horace uses the rare *derisor* ("scoffer") more than any other author. All three instances in Horace signify "a pretender," often of the worst sort (e.g., a person of low social standing fawning over the rich, like an understudy miming a lead actor, *Epist.* I.18.11; also *S.* II.6.54; cf. Mart. 1.4.5). For Horace this type of falsified praise ("scoffing") typifies the parasite (cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 1.1.69–72a, Ergasilus: *Iuventus nomen indidit Scorto mihi, / eo quia invocatus soleo esse in convivio. / scio absurde dictum hoc derisores dicere, / at ego aio recte.*).

If a painter should decide to attach a human head to a horse's neck and spackle a variety of feathers on an assortment of limbs gathered from here and there, such that a beautiful woman on top by the bottom becomes an ugly black fish, would you, friends, when let in to view it, hold your laughter? Consider, Pisos, that a book would be much like that picture, if its concepts were formed without point like the dreams of the sick, so that neither the foot nor head come together into a whole.

nec satis apparet cur versus factitet, utrum
minxerit in patrios cineres an triste bidental
moverit incestus; certe furit ac velut ursus,
obiectos caveae valuit si frangere clathros,
indoctum doctumque fugat recitator acerbus.
quem vero arripuit, tenet occiditque legendo,
non missura cutem nisi plena cruoris hirudo. (470–476)

And it is not clear at all why he keeps on versifying, whether he may have been cursed because he pissed on his ancestors' ashes or desecrated sacred ground. To be sure, he rages just like a bear, if it had the power to break its cage's locked bars, and the learned and unlearned he forces to flee, a reciter showing no mercy. Once he has grabbed on to anyone, he hangs on tightly and murders them by reading, not about to let loose of the skin until full of blood, the leech.

Horace begins and ends his discourse on poetics with two pictorial images (the centaur-turned-bird-turned-woman-turned-fish; the mad poet-turned-bear-turned-reciter-turned-leech, 472–476). From one angle, these representations surprise, particularly if detached from the middle, and deliver a shock not unlike the artist's painting, when the viewer cannot add the different parts up into a whole. If these were the only surviving verses of the *Ars*, the odds would be against anyone identifying the work as a lecture (τεχνολογία) on poetic composition. The only possible pointer is the self-assured tone of the speaker, informing his addressees that a book is like a painting. The opening does not lay out even the briefest outline for the whole, and the conclusion provides no formal recapitulation. Instead Horace, the poet/painter, starts and stops his *Ars* by setting before his reader's eyes a painter, laughed at by his audience, and a poet mad-man, "bearing" down on his victims and then sucking out their blood, a leech.

From another angle, it is reasonable to expect Horace to ensure that the opening and closing similes be comparable and coherent in their argument in spite of the outrageous extremes of their mythic and animal-figures. His *Ars Poetica* privileges unity as the fundamental quality required for any art-form (1–42) and emphasizes the connections between

beginnings and endings (*pes* [et] *caput uni reddatur formae*, 8–9), as well as the compatibility of substance and form (73–98). Horace insists that oneness and wholeness, the key to good art and the single constant throughout the letter, outweighs even the will of the artist ("Let the work be whatever the artist wants, as long as it be unified and whole," *denique sit quidvis, simplex dumtaxat et unum*, 23). If he then violates his primary rule so flagrantly that his beginning does not fit at all the conclusion, then we are not reading criticism, even if satiric, as much as nonsense.

What at first seems so disparate, does come together. Horace encodes into the two portraits, via the ill-tempered sound of the "f"-, the horrific transition from seeming innocent artistic innovation (badness) to the terror (madness) of the poet-animal cannibalizing the human ("formation, form, fame, fury, fracture, flight:" *formosa*, *fingentur*, *formae*, 4–9; *facit*, *fecit*, *famosae*, *factitet*, *furit*, *frangere*, *fugat*, 467–474).[6] Art, which should be beautiful, shapely in composition, becomes a stampeding feeding-frenzy. The audience may start out thinking that creative energy misguided is only a laughing matter, but in the end it turns violent and deadly—*The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Thus, Horace frames his *Ars* with mockery and menace. Given that his first and last exempla present a related tonality (laughter turning into menace), it remains to explore how the "head" (painting) is related too the "foot" (the bear, leech) in the particulars (*elementa*), and how any dissimilarity-similarity in the monstrosities informs Horatian poetics and criticism. The representation of the poet gone mad corrects the structural errors that the painter makes, and this change in how Horace constructs the two word-pictures teaches that the painter and mad poet share a fatal flaw, the rejection of *societas*.[7]

Horace's opening word-picture imagines for our amusement an incomprehensible painting by an artist who seriously misjudges his

[6] Reading the opening and closing together, as though they were consecutive, sounds like cursing, since the "f"- becomes progressively dominant (cf. the cursing of Lyce, *C.* IV.13; the exasperation in Anchises' prayer: *quam fessis finem rebus ferat*, Verg. *A.* 3.145a).

[7] Horace's bad painter and mad poet illustrate a category of Epicurean therapy defined by Tsouna (2009: 262) as "moral portraiture." "In outline, it consists in drawing vivid if elliptical portraits which bring out characteristic features of certain types of persons, good or bad, serene or disturbed." Their behavior is to be avoided; they are the antitypes. For a definition and description of Epicurean therapy, see Kilpatrick, 1996: 69–100; Tsouna, 2007: 52–87.

audience.[8] He begins well. He chooses a mythological theme and paints two very common and intelligible characters: a modified centaur and nymph. In his general approach to his work this painter deserves more credit than he customarily receives, since he attempts to do what the poet-critic later advises should be done, namely that an artist take traditional characters and motifs and make them his own by simple variations (119–135).[9] He puts on his centaur, a horse's neck, then feathers (perhaps a winged creature) and a variety of limbs. He paints for the radiant nymph a black and foreboding fishtail. The result, however, prompts more than just a few poorly suppressed sniggers, when his male audience is forced to work too hard to extrapolate these common-place figures from this particular painting, because the artist has not painted two separate characters, but somehow combined them into one.

The male audience (*amici*, 5), whom Horace places in front of the painting, are polite voyeurs, compared to the iambist looking over the women in epodes 8 and 12. These men view the creature's head and work their way down in order: neck; midsection; bottom. In this artist's portrait the head is perfectly appealing (*Humano capiti* ... *mulier formosa superne*), but somewhere in the middle the whole becomes a twisted convolution of horse, feathers, and fish, which defies any audience's expectations. Whatever variations may be made to a centaur—even if it is painted as a type of Pegasus-centaur—as a symbol of masculine virility and eroti-

[8] Horace's artist pulls together the various parts for his creation not unlike Prometheus when he forms the first human (*pictor* ... / *iungere si velit et varias inducere plumas* / *undique collatis membris*, *Ars* 1b–3a; *fertur Prometheus addere principi* / *limo coactus particulam undique,* / *desectam et insani leonis* / *vim stomacho apposuisse nostro*, *C.* I.16.13–16; on the proposed "coactam," refer to the text of *C.* I.16 in Chapter 5). Associating the artist, one creator, with another, Prometheus, clues the external audience into the danger that the artist patently ignores. Inventing an entirely novel combination of forms, an original creation, risks a negative response from the audience. A creator/artist can end up chained to a cliff or mocked at the art show.

[9] For once I wish S.B. had been more bold (v.128). He prints † difficile est † *proprie communia dicere*, but the logic of the argument requires not "it is difficult," but "it is preferable to put your own stamp on the tried and true." The proposed "praestiterit" (cf. Verg. *A.* 6.39) corrects the sense and anticipates well *tuque rectius*. This is a much easier solution than the debate over whether Horace's *communia* represents Aristotle's "general truths" or is synonymous with *publica materies* (v.131). If the latter, then it should include by extension *Iliacum carmen* (v.129), and it would contradictory for Horace to say in consecutive verses in essence, "It is difficult to be original with well known stories, but you are spot on in trying to do just that by turning the most familiar saga of all, the Trojan song, into a drama. Homer is an excellent model to imitate."; cf. Wickham (1891: v.128): "The connected sense of the passage seems to me then to fall to pieces."

cism it should not be female-on-top.[10] And sea maidens should be beautiful (*formosa*) and their bottom should not be vile and black (*turpiter atrum*). This composite spoils male erotic curiosity, when it simply does not add up to a comprehensible whole: very literally the head (*caput*) does not match the foot (*pes*). An audience may be prepared to grant some license for artistic choice and innovation, but their own sensibilities and desires have requirements:

> . . . 'pictoribus atque poetis
> quidlibet audendi semper fuit aequa potestas.'
> scimus, et hanc veniam petimusque damusque vicissim;
> sed non ut placidis coeant immitia, non ut
> serpentes avibus geminentur, tigribus agni. (9–13)

> "Painters and poets always had an equal claim in taking any risk they wanted." We know this, and we ask for and give in turn this latitude; but not so that the wild mate with the domesticated, not so that serpents pair with birds, lambs with tigers.

Horace's painter loses control of his art and earns ridicule for his effort at the moment he assumes he enjoys an unlimited power over his creation, and for that reason acts as if his audience comes to him like a blank canvas without any expectations, ready to receive whatever images he might draw for his own gratification without respect for their wants.

More illusive than its themes and arrangement is the picture's manner of composition. As a painting in hard form it never existed. Horace, a poet, paints together the whole scene (painter, audience, and creature) into his readers' minds not by colors but words, creating a virtual reality between his verse and the picture, so that painter cannot be differentiated from poet, reader not distinguished from viewer. The verse becomes painting and the painting verse. The comparison of the book to the painting, one of the longest sustained similes in Horatian verse, running for nearly forty lines (1–37), is developed to such a degree that the emphatic prefix *per-similem* (7) comes across like an understatement. Picture and book share forms: each has a head / beginning (*caput*) and a foot / conclusion (*pes*). Verses are composed in feet.[11] Painter and poet both claim the privilege of artistic license for their themes (9–10),

[10] For a fuller discussion on the erotics and gender dynamics in the painting, see Oliensis, 1998: 199–202.

[11] *Caput*, "section-heading" or "central point" is frequent in Cicero. *Caput* more often is applied to prose or speeches, and feet to verse. Horace with these terms neatly references both prose and verse, while he retains the primary designation of top / bottom: introduction / conclusion.

and painters' subjects duplicate Horace's: utopia (vv.12–13; epode 2; 16; *C.* IV.5.17–24); Diana's grove (v.16: *C.* III.22); the countryside (vv.16–18; *Epist.* I.10.6–7); cypresses (v.19; *C.* I.9.11–12); shipwreck (vv.20–21; *C.* I.28); wine-jars (vv.21–22; Horace, *passim*). The act of painting and writing can be described by the same verbs (*describitur*, 18; *appingit*, 30).[12] Throughout the comparison it becomes progressively harder to determine whether Horace is composing verse or conjuring up one picture after another, until by the time he describes a second artist, the sculptor with a shop nearby the Aemilian gladiatorial school, he imagines that his own verse, if poorly crafted, would be akin to a grotesque of his own face put on public display (*spectandum*, 37):[13]

> Aemilium circa Ludum faber imus[14] et unguis
> exprimet et mollis imitabitur aere capillos,
> infelix operis summa, quia ponere totum
> nesciet. hunc ego me, si quid componere curem,
> non magis esse velim quam naso vivere pravo,
> spectandum nigris oculis nigroque capillo. (32–37)

> In the vicinity of the Aemilian gladiatorial school, there is a lowly craftsman. He will copy fingernails and soft hair in bronze, but as for the complete work he is ill-starred, because he does not know how to compose the whole. I would not want to be him, if I should take care to compose something, anymore than I would be willing to live with a crooked nose, a sight to behold for my dark eyes and black hair.

The opening of the *Ars* places on view not one but two distorted images: the centaur-fish-nymph (*spectatum*, 5) and Horace himself (*spectandum*, 37), an artistic composer-turned-public spectacle. The result of this con-

---

[12] *Describere*: "paint" (Plaut. *As.* 402); "sketch" (Cic. *Rep.* 1.29.5–6; Liv. 25.31.9); "inscribe" (Verg. *A.* 3.445); cf. Hor. *S.* II.1.32–35a: Lucilius' words portray his life, … *quo fit ut omnis / votiva pateat veluti descripta tabella / vita senis. Pingere* signifies the ornate, and is common for painting, embroidery, and body art (cf. Cicero on Demosthenes' pictorial speaking style, *Brut.* 141); *appingere* is rare (in Horace it is painting, *Ars* 30; in Cicero writing, *Att.* 2.8.2).

[13] Compare Horace's verse-sculpture of Tiberius (*C.* IV.14.14–24: *spectandus in certamine Martio*, 17).

[14] S.B. follows Bentley (1711) and prints the minor *unus*, which marks the sculptor's excellence in working out nails and hair (*unguis / exprimet … imitabitur … capillos*) and offers a positive balance against *infelix*. How outstanding though is a sculptor who can master any one or two details but not comprehend the whole of his art? Bentley's correction recommends the artist's skill too much for Horace's criticism. *Imus* may give a localizing flavor by specifying the location of the sculptor's workshop (the last in the row, Ps.-Acro: ad loc.). Wickham (1891) suggests, "humble," a simple solution: an ordinary artisan would fashion well one or two parts, but lack the ability to shape them into a masterpiece.

flation is that both the artist's creation and artist are subject to laughter. The artist becomes the art, and every artist, painter, poet, or sculptor, creates out of hard material. Each, therefore, must choose material wisely or risk belittling his art and himself:

> Sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, aequam
> viribus et versate diu quid ferre recusent,
> quid valeant umeri … (38–40)
>
> Writers, take up material equal to your strength and mull over for a good while what load your shoulders refuse and what they can lift.

Likewise, a poet and painter should know how to choose appropriate colors:

> descriptas servare vices operumque colores
> cur ego si nequeo ignoroque poeta salutor? (86–87)
>
> Why, if I am unable or do not know how to uphold the designated shifts and colors of genres, am I called a poet?

Horace crosses the distinctions between book and picture so far as to form correspondences between lines of a sketch, creases on a statue, lines of letters, and his own face. When he does this, he performs the essential act in art, which the bad painter fails to realize: Horace, the consummate artist, removes the barrier between the imagined and the real (transgression / responsion / fusion). He also manages to replicate with his poetry the bad painter's slips. Through Horace's words, verse, which is art, becomes literary criticism.[15]

Horace draws his comparison between picture and book so tightly that it becomes valid to ask why the painting fails to read well.[16] This question occurs when he addresses two supposedly different types of audiences

---

[15] Putnam (1998: 188) comments on Vergil's shield of Aeneas: "It is strange enough to expect, what ekphrasis posits as a given, that words can "narrate" a piece of visual art, that one medium of the imagination is capable of translation into another." Horace is not changing his position that poetry is superior to the hard arts, his argument to Censorinus at the heart of *Odes* IV (c.8). Horace can replicate the essence of painting and sculpting in verse, but he does not imply the opposite, that a painter can imitate the power of verse in painting. The bottom line here is that Horace with his verse is correcting a poor painter; compare Smith (2005: 128–175) on the supremacy of vision and the hard arts in Vergil's *Aeneid*. Vergil, as Smith concludes, and Horace may insist on the supremacy of vision (*Ars* 179–184), but I would add do not concede the deficiency of poetry versus the hard arts. The solid arts, statues, monuments, temples, take shape when the poets create them with words. Their verses are envisioning, and therefore constitute hard art with monumental power (cf. *C.* III.30.1–5). Vergilian and Horatian poetics in this respect are Epicurean.

[16] Books like paintings are subject to different views: close-up vs. at a distance; bright

as if they were one and the same: the friends (*amici*: the male viewers), the internal audience which sees; and the recipients of the letter (both the original addressees, the Pisones, and all other readers), the external audience which reads.[17] Why can the remote audience, who is reading the painting over the shoulders of the internal audience of male viewers, not construe the text/art? This picture is composed out of many individual words, and the smallest of these words, the connectives that hold the whole together (the *ut* and *si*), muddle the entire image and betray a painter struggling to control his art.

Horace admits his propensity for brevity, *brevis esse laboro* (v.25), and his concision leads him at times to qualify a relationship between two different entities (*ut*) without stating an accompanying correlative (*sic*, *ita*, etc.), provided that clarity is not compromised ([*non*] *obscurus fio*, v.26).[18] Brink (1971: n.3) comments:

> What appears to be a dat. rather than an abl. (see prec. n. [*collatis membris*]) is then further qualified by *ut* = *ita quidem ut*, 'not of result but of added qualification' (Wickham [cf. *Epist*. I.16. n. 12: "in such a way that, i.e. with the additional qualification, that it is as cool and as pure as the Hebrus. For the use cp. A.P. 3."])—a concise phrasing often employed by H. Thus at *S*. II. 6. 82 *ut tamen* qualifies two preceding adjs., at *Ep*. II. 2. 87 *ut* qualifies a preceding clause …

A poet can qualify the relationship between objects without expressing the precise grammatical frame because the connection coheres by a natural logic. The poet only needs his subjects to share particular qualities in order to project a rational association between them, which he can

---

vs. dim light; a single viewing vs. ten viewings (*Ars* 361–365). Choerilus writes such bad epic that to see it once is enough (on Choerilus, the poster-poet for Horace's epic criticism, see Johnson, 2004b: 23–25).

[17] Commentators split over whether *amici* should be nominative or vocative (see Brink's review, 1971: n.5). S.B. (*teneatis, amici?* / *credite, Pisones*, …) with a preceding comma indicates vocative, and his final punctuation after *amici* (?) separates friends (*amici*) from *credite*, *Pisones*. He also without comment cites Markland's (1723) *teneatis? amici,* / *credite, Pisones*, a type of enjambment of the vocative/address at verse-end without parallel in Horace's hexameters (noted by Brink). What would be the advantage in such an ambiguity? *Teneatis* is at first a "concealed" (Brink) address that is clarified by the general *amici* and then the more specific *Pisones*. The general nature of the address lasts just an instant, but the slightest pause at the verse-end invites the remote reading audience to imagine themselves for a moment as the viewers and recipients of the letter. Any ambiguity only prolongs the pause and so pulls together multiple audiences.

[18] My negative *non* is implied by Horace's argument that obscurity is a vice to be avoided (*decipimur specie recti. brevis esse laboro,* / *obscurus fio*, *Ars* 25–26a).

count on the audience to deduce correctly. All three of the model texts cited (*Epist.* I.16.12; *S.* II.6.82; *Epist.* II.2.87) conform to an acceptable standard of logic for the qualification.[19] The poet-painter's *ut* (*Ars* 3), however, does not.

Horace boasts to his friend Quinctius that the *Fons Bandusiae* on his Sabine farm is as cold and pure as the Hebrus River:

> fons etiam rivo dare nomen idoneus, ut nec
> frigidior Thracam nec purior ambiat Hebrus,
> infirmo capiti fluit utilis, utilis alvo. (*Epist.* I.16.12–14)

> Also a spring, apt enough to give its name to a river, such that the Hebrus winds through Thrace neither colder nor clearer, flows wholesome for ailing head, wholesome for ailing stomach.

Horace's hyperbole, comparing a local spring to the most prominent river in Thrace, reflects his emotional attachment to his property. The spring is as vital to him as the Hebrus is to the Thracians. The exaggeration does not break down in logic because the two streams, however big or small, can share the qualities of purity and temperature. Also Horace concedes his overstatement some and softens the comparison by introducing the qualification with the referent "suitable" (*idoneus*). When the storyteller qualifies the frugal personality of the country mouse, a very different subject than rivers and streams, he follows a similar format:

> . . . 'olim
> rusticus urbanum murem mus paupere fertur
> accepisse cavo, veterem vetus hospes amicum,
> asper et attentus quaesitis, ut tamen artum
> solveret hospitiis animum.' (*S.* II.6.79–83a)

> "Once upon a time a country mouse is said to have welcomed a city mouse inside his humble hole, host and guest both old friends. The country mouse lived in meager circumstance, sparing with what he had stored, such that, nonetheless, for hospitality he would let go of his parsimony."

The mouse may be penny-poor but not to the extent that he would deny hospitality to a friend. The assumed principle is one of character: acceptable moderation does not turn a friend away from the door. Again there are clear referents for the qualification. Horace balances the mouse's circumstances "harsh" (*asper*) and "meager" (*attentus*) with the complementary "tight" (*artum*), which he then changes into a positive,

---

[19] See also *S.* I.1.95–96; 7.13; II.3.145; 7.10.

thriftiness, by the clever twist of *solveret* ("the mouse loosens his tightness for a friend"). There is nothing in the logic of the qualification or its construct that would give a reader pause.

Horace's comparison between brothers is more difficult (*Epist.* II.2.87–90):

> † Frater erat Romae † consulti rhetor, ut alter
> alterius sermone meros audiret honores,
> Gracchus ut hic illi, foret huic ut Mucius ille.
> qui minus argutos vexat furor iste poetas?

> At Rome there were brothers, one a rhetorician and the other a lawyer, such that each heard nothing but compliments from the other when he spoke. The rhetorician would be a Gracchus, the lawyer would be a Mucius for his brother. How does that madness hound melodic poets any less?

The comparison is plausible: two brothers might be expected to praise each other, although at times their compliments are not necessarily advisable or even believable. Brothers, for all their differences, stand up for each other. As if he were a lawyer himself, Horace cites historical precedent for the brothers' loyalty, the Gracchi brothers (orators) and the three renowned juriconsults (Publius Mucius Scaevola, his cousin Quintus, and son Quintus). When poets, though, exhibit the same fawning support for each other's work, their behavior is not so admirable (90). The syntax overall is not as smooth as the logic. Horace does not introduce the qualification (the one always spoke well of the other) with any clear referent to match up the two brothers other than inferences from their relationship or occupations. This slight disruption is enough to cause hesitation.[20] Both Heinsius and Meineke considered the syntax rough

[20] Brink (1982: 317): "Certainly there are words, chiefly adjectives, that do not require *tam* as an antecedent of *ut*, because a measure or degree is inherent in the quality that is asserted ... The admissibility of *ut* depends on the view taken of *frater*." In other words, it is hard to determine why Horace would expect it to be unusual that two brothers speak well of each other and go on to liken *fraternitas* to the empty flatteries that poets pass off to each other (Housman, 1889: 23–24). Brink obelizes, † Frater erat Romae †, and recommends Schütz's (1883: ad loc) "fautor." Horace's exempla of the Gracchi and Mucii support *frater*, and "fautor" does not mend the comparison completely. One "promoter" would also be expected to praise another, and although "fautor" allows more room for a negative impression than *frater*, the giving of support in and of itself does not have to be so insincere that it constitutes madness (*furor iste*). A better solution would be that Horace makes the qualification more distasteful by requiring the reader to equate a generally admirable quality with what is no more than sycophancy. Whatever subjects Horace may have given here, he does not set up the qualification with any clear referent, and that in itself causes most of the controversy. I see no problem with *Romae* since much of the letter involves the city (*Romae*, 41; *Romaene*, 65).

enough that they independently proposed a lacuna after rhetor (e.g., "uterque / alterius laudum sic admirator," *ut alter*).[21] Some manuscripts read "and" (*et*) instead of the more definitive "such that" (*ut*), so that there is no directed impulse from Horace to read into the brothers' relationship: "there were these two brothers and they supported each other."[22]

The poet-painter in the opening of the *Ars* challenges the limits of comparison even further. He also omits a clear referent to set up the qualification, and unlike any other instance in Horatian verse he does not depend on any natural logic by which an audience could suppose a correlation between his two subjects: centaur opposes sea nymph; wings oppose scaly tail.[23] One subject does not in any way entail the other, nor does one find its consequence or related outcome in the other. Therefore, the poet's connective (*ut*) forces his readers to bring into some type of natural relationship two completely disparate images; that is, the connective is overly determinant. The audience must infer without the impulse to do so and with no referent to give any guidance. The poet could have eased the problem, if he had written "and" (*et*), a looser connective (the artist's will would still have controlled both halves of the painting, *iungere si velit*, 2), rather than insist that the one image could lead naturally in some way to the next. He did not. The poet like the painter miscalculated the connective right at the point that he was joining together the two images, and that particular nonsensical linkage spoiled the whole picture: winged human-headed horse (so as) nymph with fish-tail—what a laugh!

The *ut* is not the only curious conjunction. Horace writes the entire picture as a condition, "suppose that," rendering his painter and painting nothing more than his fantasy projected before his audience. This complexity in design is not given away readily. Horace delays the supposition (*si*) for six words until he has completed one full line of verse, which introduces the painter and lays out most of the creature's upper body (*Humano*

---

[21] Heinsius, 1612: ad loc.; Meineke, 1834: ad loc.; cf. Vahlen, 1911: 513–514.

[22] *et* RΨ (exc. δ = Harleianus 2725); Cameron (1965: 13) defends the simple coordination, "The uncomfortable emphasis hitherto laid on *frater* has now disappeared; while serving to *link* the lawyer and rhetor for the purpose of the αἶνος, it is no longer forced to *explain* their mutual compliments. Nor is any such explanation required; it just so happened that the two brothers behaved in the foolish manner described."

[23] Rudd, 1989: 151, nn.3–4: "The *ut*-clause ('in such a way that') completes the picture, explaining *undique collatis membris* and adding greater detail." This logic is still convoluted. Feathers placed on an assortment of limbs do not anticipate either a woman's head or a fish's tail. The middle mixes up the top and bottom, just like the middle of a bad book mixes up the beginning and end.

capiti cervicem pictor equinam / iungere si velit, 1–2a). This is one of the more extreme postponements of an "if" in Horace's hexameters, and he does not delay to this extent in any of his lyrics.[24] Although a reader well-schooled in Horace may recognize that this "if" is "dislocated," how clear would be the effect?[25] As it concerns structure and sense, the delay places and therefore emphasizes subject first, in this case the problem of disunity. The painter's work begins with potentially incongruous forms, the human head and equine neck, and so unravels from there. Horace delivers the verse element by element, so that the painter is caught up inside the contradiction he is creating—"human head, neck, painter, equine." The whole line neatly conveys that art is the reflection of the artist, confused painter/confused art. It is also reasonable to assume that such an atypical postponement in the first lines of a letter should set a certain tone. This, however, is more open to speculation. The closest parallels indicate irony (*S.* I.4.56b–62), correction (*S.* II.3.247–249; *Epist.* I.12.1–3; *Ars* 86–87;), or lament (*C.* IV.12.13–16)—a wide variety of tonal coloring. Therefore, when the postponement occurs in the first words of a letter before any argument has been developed, it is at best predictive or leading.[26] In fact, the more knowledgeable the audience is in Horatian praxis, the harder it becomes to read the precise tone. Compared to the poet-painter's "so as," which confused by being overly determinant, the postponed "if" gives space for interpretation, perhaps too much.

The poet's frame, the smallest of words (*ut*, *si*) around which he constructs the painting, evokes the foundational question of the *Ars Poetica*. How can various elements, from the least to the greatest, be perceived in any art-form as a whole? Horace pins his theory, poetic/social, on the problem of how unity is constituted, and the incomprehensible painting becomes an object lesson in disunity, artistic and social fragmentation. The language used to draw the distorted picture, likened to a poorly conceived book/text (*undique collatis membris*, 3a; … *velut aegri somnia, vanae / fingentur species*, *ut nec pes nec caput uni / reddatur formae*, 7–9a),

---

[24] *C.* IV.12.14–15 contains a five-word delay, but *si* is in the first position of the next verse (*sed pressum Calibus ducere Liberum / si gestis, iuvenum nobilium cliens*); cf. Horace's hexameters: *Epist.* I.12.1–3 delays by six words, but again *si* leads off the next verse; *S.* I.4.56–57 (eight) and *Ars* 86–87 (seven); see Brink, 1971: nn.1–2.

[25] "Dislocated" comes from Brink, *supra*.

[26] *Epist.* I.12.1–2 is the only parallel that begins a poem, but in this case the two words after "if" clearly indicate criticism (*si recte frueris*); *iungere si velit* (*Ars* 2) is not so openly pejorative. Horace's longest delay occurs when he denies the intricacy of his satiric hexameter, while his word-order, including the postponed *si*, testifies to his artfulness (*S.* I.4.56–62).

both recalls Lucretius' description of atomic collision and combination, occurring when a swerve effects the atoms moving downward through the void (Lucr. 2.62–729), and imitates Lucretius' explanation for mythic creatures and nighttime dreams:

at contra nulli de nulla parte neque ullo
tempore inane potest vacuum subsistere rei,
quin, sua quod natura petit, concedere pergat;
omnia quapropter debent per inane quietum
aeque ponderibus non aequis concita ferri.
haud igitur poterunt levioribus incidere umquam
ex supero graviora neque ictus gignere per se
qui varient motus per quos natura gerat res.
quare etiam atque etiam paulum inclinare necessest
corpora ... (2.235–244)

But the empty void cannot impede any body in any place at any time, so that, as its nature requires, it continually gives way; therefore, all bodies, even though they are not the same weight, must move through the tranquil void at the same rate. The heavier are unable to fall from above on the lighter and they are unable on their own to produce blows that could vary motions through which nature generates things. Wherefore, I reiterate the atoms must swerve a little ...

dissimiles igitur formae glomeramen in unum
conveniunt et res permixto semine constant.

Nec tamen omnimodis conecti posse putandum est
omnia. nam vulgo fieri portenta videres,
semiferas hominum species existere et altos
interdum ramos egigni corpore vivo,
multaque conecti terrestria membra marinis,
tum flammam taetro spirantis ore Chimaeras
pascere naturam per terras omniparentis. (2.686–687, 700–706)

Different particles, therefore, combine into one mass, and substances are composed of seeds mixed together.

You must not suppose that every combination of atoms is possible; if this were the case, you would see monsters about everywhere, beast-people would exist, and now and again human bodies would sprout branches, and sea animals would have the limbs of land animals. Moreover nature throughout the earth, the parent of all, would nourish Chimaeras breathing fire from their hideous mouths.

principio hoc dico, rerum simulacra vagari
multa modis multis in cunctas undique partis
tenuia, quae facile inter se iunguntur in auris,

obvia cum veniunt, ut aranea bratteaque auri.
quippe etenim multo magis haec sunt tenuia textu
quam quae percipiunt oculos visumque lacessunt,
corporis haec quoniam penetrant per rara cientque
tenuem animi naturam intus sensumque lacessunt.
Centauros itaque et Scyllarum membra videmus
Cerbereasque canum facies simulacraque eorum
quorum morte obita tellus amplectitur ossa;

nec ratione alia, cum somnus membra profudit,
mens animi vigilat, nisi quod simulacra lacessunt
haec eadem nostros animos quae cum vigilamus,
usque adeo, certe ut videamur cernere eum quem
relicta vita iam mors et terra potitast.
hoc ideo fieri cogit natura, quod omnes
corporis offecti sensus per membra quiescunt
nec possunt falsum veris convincere rebus. (4.724–734, 757–764)[27]

This is my first point—there are images from objects drifting about in many ways in all sorts of directions. These films are thin, and emitted into the air they are easily joined together when they meet each other, like spider's web and gold leaf. To be sure these films are much thinner in their weave than those which impact our eyes and rouse sight, since these penetrate through the gaps of the body and stir the subtle nature of the mind within and rouse sensation. Thus, we see Centaurs and canine-limbed Scyllas, and multi-headed dogs like Cerberus, and likenesses of the dead whose bones the earth embraces.

Likewise, when our bodies relax in sleep, our mind stays alert, and the same films that impacted our minds, when we were awake, still do but to such an extent that we are sure that we see a person whose life has been lost and whom death and the earth possess. This occurs according to nature because when all bodily sensations have been curbed and are at rest, they are unable to counter false things with true.

Horace's view of the confused painting represents rather precise Epicurean physics, which insists that the senses, in particular seeing, are the preeminent instruments for perceiving reality (*Ars* 183–184; cf. Lucr. 4.230–721).[28] The artist's audience must be able to detect some intercon-

[27] Cf. Lucr. 4.454–468 (n.b. 467–468, *nam nil aegrius est quam res secernere apertas / ab dubiis, animus quas ab se protinus addit*); 5.878–924 (n.b. 878–880a, *Sed neque Centauri fuerunt, nec tempore in ullo / esse queunt duplici natura et corpore bino / ex alienigenis membris compacta*). Horace condenses into his painting/poem the Epicurean physics Lucretius covers in his book 2 and two-thirds of book 4. Horace is always quick to compress epic.

[28] On Horace's Epicurean poetics in view of Philodemus and Lucretius, see Obbink's seminal work (1995).

nection among the particles (images) in the void (on the canvas), otherwise no meaningful conception of the art, unity, can take place. In this instance, the audience rightly sees all the various images in the painting/poem, but when the smallest particles of all resist interpretation (*ut*, *si*), what in actuality the senses perceive becomes incomprehensible. An artist's creative work, in painting or poetry, resides primarily in designing (arranging) potential relationships in his material (*materia*), so that the whole is innovative but still *sensible* to the various perspectives of the viewers. How the elements are joined matters (Lucr. 2.686–729). Any variation in their connection alters the outcome (*res*). Lucretius' proof is verse. Words contain common elements, but altering the combination of the elements changes the word; reordering the words changes the verse (2.688–694). Physics is artistic theory. The bad painter only knows half of the lesson, innovation by arrangement. He misses that not all connections hold together; if they did, the Chimaera—or the painter's flying centaur/sea maiden—could actually exist by nature. If the painter were a poet, his introduction and conclusion would fail to form a single shape (… *isti tabulae fore librum* / … *ut nec pes nec caput uni* / *reddatur formae*, *Ars* 6–9a).

Ultimately how well the artist performs his role (his theory) rests on how he understands his relationship to his audience (social dynamics). Poetry, like this painting, consists of forms and void, images and space. The formation of art depends on the "swerve" (*corpora* … *declinare solerent* …; *declinamus item motus nec tempore certo* / *nec regione loci certa, sed ubi ipsa tulit mens?*, Lucr. 2.217–260): the act of interpretation occurring through the "impulse" for an artist and audience together to negotiate connections between the forms that will result in an imaginative and creative whole.[29] Too much or too little space between the various figures, too many overly determined connectives, like that *ut*, or indeterminate connectives, like that *si*, will leave the audience mocking the artist and laughing over the absence of unity in the work. What Horace shows us, then, is more than objectified art; it is the art-show. We are watching a common social occasion gone badly. An artist puts on display before an audience his own creation for them to enjoy. When the figures (*elementa*) do not add up in any way to a whole, ridicule replaces the pleasure of dynamic social interaction. Disunity in art is social fragmentation, comparable to the "iambic" crisis in the *Epodes*. The artist and audience stand

[29] Cf. word-formation by innovative combinations: *in verbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis* / *dixeris egregie, notum si callida verbum* / *reddiderit iunctura novum*, *Ars* 46–48a.

opposed unable to cross the intellectual divide that separates them. This is in fact the critical ("iambic") crisis within Horace's poetic theory: the failure of art to give shape to meaningful pluralities.

Why would this painter be so blind that he would subject himself to public rejection and ridicule (*Ravide … quid vis*, Cat. 40; *Quid tibi vis*, epode 12.1; cf. ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε;, Archil. 172 W)?[30] Horace does not indicate that the artist expects anything other than the audience's approval, but could it be possible that he might just not care how his audience will react? The painter creates his image because that is what he wants to do regardless: *si velit*, 2; '*quidlibet audendi … potestas*', 10; *denique sit quidvis*, 23; *qui … cupit*, 29. He is an artistic tyrant, creating for his own gratification, according to his dictates. Since his is the only perspective that *matters*, he undervalues his audience and excludes their expectations from the creative process. Horace, on the other hand, is about to ground his review of the divisions of poetry and generic characteristics, as well as their attendant rules (119–294), on the premise that art is a negotiated pleasure between author and audience:[31]

si curat cor spectantis tetigisse querela.[32]
non satis est pulchra esse poemata; dulcia sunto,
et quocumque volent animum auditoris agunto. (98–100)

If he cares about touching the viewer's heart with his lament. It is not enough for poems to be beautiful; let them be sweet, and lead where they will the mind of the hearer.

… male si mandata loqueris,
aut dormitabo aut ridebo …
si dicentis erunt fortunis absona dicta,
Romani tollent equites peditesque cachinnum. (104–113)

If what you say is inappropriate, either I will sleep or laugh … if the speaker's words are out of step with his circumstances, Romans in the most expensive and cheap seats will roar with laughter.

---

[30] For a fuller discussion of Cat. 40, epode 12, and Archil. 172 W, see Chapter 1.

[31] From the outset of the *Ars*, the unity in the *elementa* (*materia*) of art pivots around the unity of author and audience. Accordingly, *Tu quid ego et populus mecum desideret audi* (153) would not be an abrupt transition; compare Armstrong, 1993: 187.

[32] I erased S.B.'s break for a new paragraph after verse 98. Horace's argument is not that the artist can lead the audience anywhere at his will (99–100), but that he must expect the audience to have particular reactions according to the stimuli. A sad audience imitates a sad representation, etc., and this reaction is a principle of nature (101–111). The art and the audience's reaction to it are linked by natural expectations.

Tu quid ego et populus mecum desideret audi:
si plausoris eges aulaea manentis et usque
sessuri donec cantor 'vos plaudite' dicat,
aetatis cuiusque notandi sunt tibi mores
mobilibusque decor naturis dandus et annis. (153–157)

You, hear what I and the general audience desire. If you want your audience to clap, staying for the curtain and remaining in their seats until the singer announces, "Applaud," you must pay attention to the mannerisms of each age category and assign what befits the changing natures and years.

quodcumque ostendis mihi sic, incredulus odi. (188)

Whatever you show me this way, I unconvinced reject.

offenduntur enim quibus est equus et pater et res,
nec, si quid fricti ciceris probat et nucis emptor,
aequis accipiunt animis donantve corona. (248–250)

Some are offended, such as the knight, and patrician, and man of means; and they, if something pleases a buyer of chickpeas and chestnuts, do not necessarily follow suit and award it the prize.

Horace is assuming that an artist on the most pragmatic level cares about keeping his audience in their seats and from laughing at him.[33] If this is so, then the willful painter in his attitude toward his audience may be only one step away from the rich poet, who will barter his poems like an auctioneer, no matter how good or poor they may be, to an audience prepared to fawn over them only because of his wealth (*Ars* 419–425):

Ut praeco, ad merces turbam qui cogit emendas,
assentatores iubet ad lucrum ire poeta
dives agris, dives positis in faenore nummis.
si vero est unctum qui recte ponere possit

[33] Horace acknowledges that praise, if distinct from the more crass motive of gain, can be a positive poetic goal (compare the Greeks desire for praise, *Grais ingenium, Grais dedit ore rotundo / Musa loqui, praeter laudem nullius avaris*, 323–324, with the Roman fixation on profit margin, 325–332). Horace reiterates often that the successful dramatist knows and makes allowances for his audience. This emphasis bridges the transitions between Brink's first and second sections for the *Ars*: (1) order and style and (2) the organization of genres. Yet, accommodations to the audience can be negative. Tragedians introduced the satyr play to accommodate the audience's more ignoble tendencies (220–224), and a tolerant or ignorant audience does not justify carelessness. The availability of excellent Greek models takes away any excuse (263–269). The artist can and should be prepared to work above the audience's literary sensibilities.

> et spondere levi pro paupere et eripere artis
> litibus implicitum, mirabor si sciet inter-
> noscere mendacem verumque beatus amicum.[34]

> Like an auctioneer, who entices a crowd to buy the merchandise, so the poet, well-propertied and rich from the interest on loans he has made, bids the yes-men to come take their profit. But if the poet happens to be someone who can properly put out a sumptuous dinner and put up bail for a poor man with little credit and save someone embroiled in tough litigation, I will be amazed, if the fortunate fellow is able to discriminate between a false and true friend.

How much difference is there between thinking that the audience does not matter or approval matters so much that all the artist needs from the audience are their flatteries? Before you know it an artist could become so egocentric that he would no longer care whether his friends are true or false, as long as they showed up to look and listen, and praise. He would be willing to mistake flattery for criticism. "If art is wanting, running away from a fault leads to vice" (*in vitium ducit culpae fuga, si caret arte*, 31). And would not trading in a slip-up (making poor connections) for total defect (absolute self-obsession) be insane?

The best excuse a bad artist may have for persisting is insanity. Enter Horace's last word-portrait, 468–476: the poet without excuse or explanation, a lunatic (*aut fanaticus error et iracunda Diana,/vesanum … poetam*, 454–455). This poet keeps on composing without any reasonable motivation (*nec satis apparet cur versus factitet*, 470a); he continues in spite of facing blatant rejection by his audience.[35] His dogged commitment to his art proves fatal. He embraces death, hoping that it might come with fame (*famosae mortis amorem*, 469b), and resists any and all outside intervention (*nec semel hoc fecit, nec, si retractus erit, iam/fiet homo*, 468–469a). Horace can guess no reason for this poet writing verse other than he is ill-omened and cursed, a fellow who would piss on his

[34] The loan-shark Alfius lied, when he named the peasant farmer "blessed." Horace's disingenuous *beatus*, "the happy chap" (v.425) within a context of land-owning, loan-sharking, and law-suits (the world of epode 2) adds an iambic coloring, which recalls that the blessed state often turns out to be an illusion of the most frightening variety, self-deception (see epode 2, Chapter 1). In Horace *lucrum* is positive only once (*C.* I.9.14), and in the *Ars* profit has the potential to ruin poetry, because it prevents genuine exchange between poet and audience. So much for being able to separate poetics from the patron-client relationship.

[35] The inspiration for Horace's mad poet may originate with Callimachus, *Iamb* 1.78–79 Pf. (ἀλλ' ἣν ὁρῇ τις, 'οὗτος Ἀλκμέων' φηϲει/καὶ 'φεῦγε· βάλλει· φεῦγ'' ἐρεῖ 'τὸν ἄνθρωπον.'). Clayman (1980: 14–16), followed by Acosta-Hughes (2002: 54–55), reads these lines as an imagined counter-attack against a mad iambist.

ancestor's ashes (471).[36] In keeping with that extreme characterization, Horace portrays the poet's frenetic versifying with a horrendous metamorphosis from the animal to human, and then back into animal: crazy poet, turned raging bear (*certe furit ac velut ursus*, 472b), turned strident reciter (*recitator acerbus*, 474b), turned engorged blood-sucking leech (*plena cruoris hirudo*, 476b). These are vivid figures, but at the same time common in nature and experience. Horace has in effect demythologized the bad painter's mixed-up art. Yet his originality, like the painter, lies in the selection and arrangement of material. He was the one who thought to combine them on the same poetic canvas (*proprie communia dicere*, 128); but, unlike the opening painting, this last word-picture operates without any overly determinant or indeterminate connectives. Horace modifies the postponed *si* and omits the *ut*, with the result that his art draws these diverse creatures into a uniform whole. Moreover, by reworking the fault lines in the initial painting (*si*, *ut*), he signals that his poetics are of a different type than either the bad painter or mad poet.

Horace writes the painter's desire, which was the motivation shaping his art (*iungere si velit*, 2), into a very different condition:

> . . . certe furit ac velut ursus,
> obiectos caveae valuit si frangere clathros,
> indoctum doctumque fugat recitator acerbus.
> quem vero arripuit, tenet occiditque legendo,
> non missura cutem nisi cruoris hirudo. (472–476)

> For sure, he rages and just like a bear, if it had the power to break its cage's locked bars, the learned and unlearned he forces to flee, a reciter showing no mercy. Once he has grabbed on to anyone, he hangs on tightly and murders them by reading, not about to let go of the skin until full of blood, the leech.

Similarity in sound and sense (*si velit*: *valuit si*) encourages comparison. At a glance it appears Horace has prolonged the delay of the "if" from six words in the poem's opening condition to eight, when in fact he has

[36] McKeown (2010: 189–190) includes in his *Cabinet of Roman Curiosities* inscriptions warning against such sacrilege: "Anyone who pisses or shits here, may the gods above and the gods below be angry with him;" "Stranger, my bones beg you not to piss at my grave. If you want to be nicer have a shit. This is the grave of Urtica ('Nettle'). Go away, shitter! It's not safe to expose your ass here" (*CIL* 6.13740; 4.8899). McKeown notes several ironies: the latrinae at Ostia had toilet seats recycled from gravemarkers; the second triumvirate remodeled the place where Caesar was assassinated into a toilet (Cass. Dio 47.19). How insane then would it be, Octavian, to piss on a relative's grave? The accidental satire is often the best.

corrected the displacement. *Valuit si frangere* is only one component in an alliterated verbal chain (*furit* ... *frangere* ... *fugat*). Horace, by assigning the supposition a clearly related verbal element, turns the condition into a parenthetical qualification lending further color to the behavior of the bear-reciter (*furit* ... [*valuit si frangere*] ... *fugat* ... *tenet*). Within its verse, which now operates more independently and without enjambment in the condition, the delay is cut in half, down to three words (*obiectos caveae valuit*), and the "if" is located nicely in the middle of the line.[37] The supposition is now detached enough not to dictate the whole but sufficiently connected so as to enhance the intensity of the word-picture: the literary hack should be kept behind bars like a bear; if he breaks out he will go on a rampage against whomever he meets. One artist's willful intention (*iungere velit*) becomes another's bestial defiant assault (*valuit frangere*), a shift which encapsulates the disaster in the bad painter's and mad poet's art. When an artist mishandles his work and then refuses to acknowledge the resulting criticism, any desire he may have for unity ends instead in mayhem. Horace, to the contrary, will not be such an artistic tyrant.

Horace erases the painter's/poet's overly determined art (*ut*). He can present his characters, bear-reciter-leech, in simple sequence, one after the other, because the connections between them are easily managed according to audience expectations. The bear, clever and strong enough to break through the cage-bars, scatters the terrified crowd. The reciter grabs hold of his prey with a bear-like grip, determined to kill, and he clings to the skin, sating himself with his victim's blood, a leech. The characters in series exhibit in their actions a progressive emotive logic, which in turn directs the audience's imagination to draw the figures into a whole. In short, Horace ensures that all the animals and persons act on cue. Again there is nothing novel about the characters in and of themselves except for their combination. Horace enjoins the whole well by linking the ordinary into an original series that achieves an entirely new effect, which is how he earlier characterized the power of his own song:

---

[37] Horace ends his criticism of the inept sculptor, which complements the bad painter, with a supposition that corrects the displaced *si* in similar fashion: ... *hunc ego me, si quid componere curem, / non magis esse velim quam naso vivere pravo, / spectandum nigris oculis nigroque capillo*, 35–37. While the sculptor puts Horace's nose out of joint, Horace shows that he knows how to express his own wishes in a well-crafted, *componere*, balanced condition (*curem* ... *velim*; *magis esse* ... *quam vivere*).

ex noto fictum carmen sequar, ut sibi quivis
speret idem, sudet multum frustraque laboret
ausus idem: tantum series iuncturaque pollet,
tantum de medio sumptis accedit honoris. (*Ars* 240–243)

I will make my goal the song fashioned from the familiar so that anyone, hoping the same for himself, will soak himself in sweat and toil in vain when he dares an imitation: arrangement and connection have such power, the commonplaces [*de medio sumptis*] have such charm.

Thus Horace demonstrates through the mad poet's metamorphosis, the closing performance of his poetics, that his craft surpasses that of the sculptor near the gladiatorial school of Aemilius, who can control the details of crafting fingernails and hair, but cannot structure a complete image (32–37). Horace presents his interpretive connections logically but not too tightly. He appreciates that the separate elements of any poem/picture, whatever he may imagine, can never explain (add up to) the effect of the whole, and therefore he leaves enough space for the audience's imagination to join him in creating the art. Author and audience through the art transgress into a shared world, what Horace, when describing the material for his poetry, names the middle (*de medio sumptis*, 243), the commonplaces providing the contact between himself and his readers.

Poets do not always draw from the middle, and poetics instead of rising to the top can sink to the bottom:

ut gratas inter mensas symphonia discors
et crassum unguentum et Sardo cum melle papaver
offendunt, poterat duci quia cena sine istis,
sic animis natum inventumque poema iuvandis,
si paulum summo decessit, vergit ad imum. (*Ars* 374–378)

As at scrumptious banquets, a poorly-tuned symphony, and a thick unguent, and poppy seeds served with Sardinian honey cause upset, because the banquet could have gone over well without them, so a poem, birthed and conceived for the heart's delight, if it falls just a little short of full expectation, drops to the bottom.

Once more Horace is having some serious fun with Lucretian poetics and Epicurean physics. Lucretius (1.935–950) likens his poetry to the honey on the cup, which baits a child to take his medicine, Epicurean philosophy, because it is good for him. He then follows this bit of sweetness with his defense for infinity (1.951–1117), that there can be no subtracting from the sum total (*summum*) of void or atoms. An infinite void permits no center (*nam medium nil esse potest ... / infinita*, 1.1070a–1071a),

and if atoms fall short in any part of the void, it opens a vacuum through which the world collapses (*nam quacumque prius de parti corpora desse / constitues, haec rebus erit pars ianua leti, / hac se turba foras dabit omnis materiai*, 1.1111–1113). Horace plays the metaphor differently (374–378). If the honey-sweetened poppy seed turns out to be bitter, the banqueter will not forgive the poor-tasting delicacy (poetry), because he could have enjoyed himself without it. Therefore, second-rate poetry is not to be tolerated. It is all or nothing: if poetry, created for delighting the soul, falls only a little short of the whole (*si paulum summo decessit*, 378a), it sinks to the bottom (*vergit ad imum*, 378b).

Horace ends his *Ars Poetica* with a fall, more commonplace and amusing but deadly nonetheless.[38] The blood-sucking versifier, stalking down an audience, is part of a larger story about a poet so caught up in his work that he falls down into a hole (*Ars* 453–469):

> Ut mala quem scabies aut morbus regius urget
> aut fanaticus error et iracunda Diana,
> vesanum tetigisse timent fugiuntque poetam
> qui sapiunt: agitant pueri incautique sequuntur.
> hic, dum sublimis versus ructatur et errat,
> si veluti merulis intentus decidit auceps
> in puteum foveamve, licet 'succurrite' longum
> clamet, 'io cives!' non sit tollere curet.
> si curet quis opem ferre et demittere funem,
> 'qui scis an prudens huc se proiecerit atque
> servavi nolit?' dicam, Siculique poetae
> narrabo interitum. deus immortalis haberi
> dum cupit Empedocles, ardentem frigidus Aetnam
> insiluit. sit ius liceatque perire poetis.
> invitum qui servat, idem facit occidenti.
> nec semel hoc fecit, nec, si retractus erit, iam
> fiet homo et ponet famosae mortis amorem.

> Just as the sick person, whom a bad rash or jaundice, costly to treat, afflicts, or frantic delirium or lunacy, Diana's rage, those who know better are afraid to touch the crazed poet and they run away; careless children egg him

[38] Unlike Lucretius' void, Horatian poetics has a center, and based on the principle of unity (*simplex*) it should be able to be located by examining the top (beginning) and the bottom (end). Horace is still more in tune with Lucretius than Cicero. Lucretius gives a final negative exemplum, defending the necessity of Epicurean physics by detailing the Athenian plague and its terror, the fall, if you will, of a great society (cf. Kilpatrick, 1996: 69–100). "Cicero would never have made the climax of the *Orator* a comic picture of a failed orator, his audience alienated and his client ruined, suffering a fatal accident to the delight of all bystanders" (Armstrong, 1993: 186).

> on and chase after him. This poet, while belching out verses and roaming around with his head in the clouds, as if he were a fowler eyeing blackbirds, falls into a well or pit; although he shouts for a long time, "Citizens, hurry, come help!," no one would care to pull him out. If someone should want to help and send down a rope, I will say, "Who can tell whether he threw himself in, knowing full well what he was doing, and does not want to be saved?," and I will tell the story of the Sicilian poet's death. Empedocles, desiring to be considered an immortal god, jumped coolly into flaming Aetna. Let poets have the privilege of killing themselves. If someone saves the poet against his will, he might as well be a murderer too. And the poet did not do this just once, and once rescued he will not become normal and forget about his desire for fame-by-death.

Parts of the scene are common to everyday life.[39] Someone, while concentrating on some thought, steps off an unseen curb and takes a fall. We have all tripped up like this at one time or another, and we can sympathize with the embarrassment and often injury that results. Horace once, while caught up mulling over his own little poems, accidentally ran into an upstart pest, whom he could not ditch (*S.* I.9). What is unusual about this distracted poet at the end of Horace's *Ars* is that he may in fact enjoy being in the hole, refusing to be helped up and out. He is possessed by the same death-wish as Empedocles, who in hope of immortality threw himself into Mount Aetna's volcanic heat. Everyone knows the natural and appropriate responses to such a fall are fright and crying for rescue. No one in their right mind would want to stay in a pit, let alone throw oneself into the largest fire-hole in the known world with such cool calm (*frigidus*). This artist suffers from a psychological imbalance. He is a sick lunatic, best avoided in case he is contagious. But, Horace's account

[39] The first malady (*scabies*, 453) repeats the call in the children's game of chase, used to taunt the one tagged, "You're it!" (*an satis est dixisse 'ego mira poemata pango. / occupet extremum scabies*, 416–417a; cf. Porph. ad 417: *Hoc ex lusu puerorum sustulit, qui ludentes solent dicere: Quisquis ad me novissimus venerit, habeat scabiem*). Armstrong (1993: 218) interprets the echo: "Horace dissipates the serious tone in farce, and in juvenile farce," which would appeal to a young Piso. Could it also be, however, that what was child's play, *scabies*, turns deadly with the mad poet? Horace's echo takes metaphor and imagines it as reality. This is not just pretend anymore. If a person were in truth sick, you would not be tagging them but running away—unless you were still a kid. Horace's portrait of the self-obsessed poet amuses and delights, and not on a childish level only. By applying the metaphor of a children's game of chase to adulthood, Horace is demanding that Piso grow up. Piso must keep in mind that writing poetry is not all fun and games. The movement of the whole (*scabies / scabies*, 417; 453) illustrates that Horace has adept control of his own advice: behavior represented should be age appropriate (*aetatis cuiusque notandi sunt tibi mores / mobilibusque decor naturis dandus et annis*, 156–157). Will the want-to-be-poet Piso grow up and meet this standard?

transgresses by not allowing us to keep our distance from the sick poet. Horace insists on an inside look at the mad poet, when he stands his audience, the would-be rescuer, at the edge of the hole, peering down, while he wonders aloud whether or not the poet could have actually decided to throw himself in. We could take one more step closer to the poet's madness and from his point of view (responsion) consider what would be so bad about staying stuck in one's hole anyway. The question appears absurd, unless we imagine a metaphoric connection between the puzzling *whole* of Horace's opening painting and the destructive *hole* that captivates the obsessed poet at the end. Horace's art of poetry at its center is all about creating the whole, negotiating the pluralities that exist within interpretive space.

Being stuck in a (w)hole of one's own making does have advantages, if we allow ourselves some space for imaginative speculation. The poet in the (w)hole can enjoy his own perspective without any obstacles or interruptions from outside interpreters. If he looks at the circle of dirt around him or at the circle of the sky above him, he can with self-imposed certitude know exactly where he is and what is what. He knows everything—up, down, and all around. If he should imagine anything beyond these parameters, again this vision comes from his perspective alone. The poet can feel completely empowered in his own (w)hole. If anyone happens upon his hole and looks down on him, the poet has the spotlight (very literally in the drama of an audience with light behind them looking down into a black space). In his hole he does not have to share the stage with anyone else. Best of all perhaps is that while everyone's eyes are focused on him, he can play the role of the victim. It is not his fault surely that he is in the hole, and as a person in a weaker position he can beg for help, and a sympathetic audience can lend him a hand.

There is no indication that the mad poet would want to stay in the hole, unless at some point he were noticed and gained the attention of someone passing by.[40] Horace's word picture/tale requires on-lookers—an audience given to confusion because of the actions of the poet. A poet who writes totally from within a "whole" of his own choice bewilders his audience. Without any space for them, they simply cannot figure out anything of consequence to imagine. On the other hand, if the poet feels trapped and cries out for help, surely he does actually want them, his

[40] Theophrastus' "shameless" (ἀπονενοημένος) also demands an audience for however long they can stand him (*Char.* 6.7).

audience, to enter his "whole" and rescue him (fusion). The *krisis*, then, in this final parable comes when the audience outside of the poet's (w)hole lets the rope down (the rope could well symbolize this *Ars Poetica* with its balanced views of convention and creativity, of audience and artist). When the rope drops into the poet's space and he refuses to grab hold, at that moment the outsider (audience) knows that the poet is staying inside of his own volition and they will remain outside. And they realize that the autonomy of the poet trapped within his own "whole" makes no sense. The poet is absolutely "certifiable." His tragic game of crying for help that he really does not want is now exposed, and the audience must choose between pity, disdain, even possibly anger—more than likely all of these emotions—which certainly will add up to the rejection of the artist and his work. "Poets are obsessed with their own gratification and immortal fame. / Let them go ahead and die trying to earn it" (v.466). So, the final word-picture (the mad poet) ends where the first (the bad painter) ended: the disintegration of society, the impenetrable "whole" fixed and separating poet and audience, the crisis that occurs when art does not progress beyond individualized limits.

At the Middle of Horace's Ars

Since the poet-critic of the *Ars* teaches that beginnings and endings must converge in a meaningful way with middles (*primo ne medium, medio ne discrepet imum*, 152), he invites his audience to explore what expectations for the whole of the *Ars* he creates by his opening and concluding word-pictures.[41] What sort of middle would they best frame?

First, to adopt a wider view, Horace's first (*Satires* / *Epodes*) is evident in his last.[42] The *Ars* provides the ultimate cap for Horace's literary criticism, because the blame he casts at the poor painter and misguided murderous blood-sucking poet indicates that he cares not just about the excellence of poetry, how it is composed, but that poetry, when it is properly conceived, serves a vital societal interest (391–407) through its ability

[41] "To inquire whether the lyric verse of the poet Horace satisfies the claims made by the critic is beyond the scope of this book" (Brink, 1963: 213). I am not criticizing Brink for putting off the question too easily. His commentary is masterful and long enough. Yet, he must have known that this very issue sparks much of the curiosity about the *Ars*. What precisely is the dividing line between good and bad poetry; how does Horace fit his own literary production within this particular frame?

[42] Compare Lyce's weak song (repulsive rather than seductive) near the end of *Odes* IV, c.13.

both to construct and move beyond barriers (*sic honor et nomen divinis vatibus atque / carminibus venit*, 400–401a).[43] Poor poetry, being outright dangerous for society, cannot go unanswered:

ingenium misera quia fortunatius arte
credit et excludit sanos Helicone poetas
Democritus, bona pars non unguis ponere curat,
non barbam, secreta petit loca, balnea vitat.
nanciscetur enim pretium nomenque poeta
si tribus Anticyris caput insanabile numquam
tonsori Licino commiserit. o ego laevus,
qui purgor bilem sub verni temporis horam!
non alius faceret meliora poemata. verum
nil tanti est. ergo fungar vice cotis, acutum
reddere quae ferrum valet exsors ipsa secandi;
munus et officium nil scribens ipse docebo,
unde parentur opes, quid alat formetque poetam,
quid deceat, quid non, quo virtus, quo ferat error. (*Ars* 295–308)

Since Democritus believes that genius is more blessed than lowly art and bars from Helicon sober poets, quite a number do not take care to trim their nails or beard; they seek secluded places, avoid the baths. One will gain admiration and the name "poet," if he never trusts the barber Licinus to trim the hair on his head, not to be cured by three Anticyras. How silly am I, who purge my bile at the arrival of spring! No one else would write better poetry. But it is not worth my while. So then, I will play the role of the whetstone, which has the strength to sharpen the blade without being able of itself to cut; I will write nothing, but service and duty I will teach: where the resources can be found, what nurtures and shapes the poet, what is appropriate, what not, where virtue, where error leads.

On the most basic level Horace's temper, evident here and in the letter's major transitions, requires his audience to take his *Ars* and its criticisms with a degree of seriousness. The question becomes to what degree. Horace is so offended by the crazed poets he sees around him (*insani poetae*: *ingenium*; note the similarity in argument and tone to *Epist.* I.19.10–20) that he is willing to alter his career, sacrifice writing, and teach (*sanus criticus*: *ars*). The comic irony in his announcement that he will forego composing, while writing a letter in hexameter verse, is patently transparent. This is not a master poet so angry that he is going into seclusion, but mad enough to engage his colleagues in a new way. Horace pictures himself as a whetstone, which has the strength to sharpen a blade without itself doing any cutting (*exsors ipsa secandi*,

[43] Cf. *Epist.* II.1.118–138.

305b). A whetstone is not a knife. Nonetheless every knife needs a whetstone or it will eventually become dull and useless. Again Horace's criticism aims at forging a diversified unity: knife and whetstone together.

Second, Horace's beginning and ending provide vital, if general impressions, about the manner of his poetics. We should not expect that he would present theory via a systematic and formulaic construct or outline.[44] The opening and closing predict that the poet-critic will instead leave enough interpretive space for the audience to involve themselves in the creation of meaning. The *Ars Poetica* is an art show. This strategy necessitates avoiding close-ended answers to such difficult questions as what is the relationship between technical skill (*ars*) and genius (*ingenium*), 408–418. We could anticipate, however, that Horace would include enough structure and formal terminology from literary treatises (Aristotle, Neoptolemus, Philodemus) to prompt the reader to make meaningful connections. That is to say, he does not leave so much open space that the audience, left without any signposts, becomes lost. The debate, therefore, over the primary models and sources for Horace's poetics has its genesis in the very theory that his *Ars Poetica* embodies.[45] Form, style, and content become indistinguishable and cannot be divorced from the act of interpretation: Horace is choosing and shaping his material in such a way that it can be drawn by his audience into a whole that they have fashioned together with him. The letter-form is a perfect medium for this strategy. This is not the same as saying that the *Ars* lacks a definitive and coherent argument. There is a clear flow in thought, beginning with the bad painter and moving on from there as a logical consequence. The whole of Horace's poetics revolves around the premise that poetry through the combination of its matter forms the plural. It draws into one interpretive space author, audience, critic, mortal and immortal. Therefore, good poetry, like Horatian iambic, occupies the "threshold," creating a link between divided realities.[46]

---

[44] See also Phld. *On Poetry* V: the *elementa* of poetics form too coherent a whole to be subdivided into mutually exclusive categories (n.b. xiii.32-xv.2; xviii.34-xxix.6; xxx.25–33, as summarized by Armstrong, 1993: 220–222).

[45] On the controversy in general, see Brink, 1971: xii–xxi. No source has ever had exclusive rights over Horace's *Ars*: Aristotle (e.g., Rudd, 1989: 26; Brink, 1963: 79–89; Harrison, 2007b: 4–8); Neoptolemus (e.g., Porph. ad 1: *In quem librum congessit praecepta Neoptolemi* τοῦ Παριανοῦ *de arte poetica, non quidem omnia, sed eminentissima*; cf. Rostagni, 1930: xciv–cvii; Brink, 1963: 90–150); Philodemus (e.g., Armstrong, 1993).

[46] "So therefore it isn't right to enumerate (virtues of poetry) in a didactic treatise one by one, but to state the general principle that runs through it; or, if we think that the

Since Horace does not present poetry as a predetermined object but as the product of the dynamic interactions between artist and audience, his *Ars* does not draw sharp divisions between social and literary structures. In Horace's poetics society and art are completely interdependent: they each create the other. For example, economics and social standing are artistic forces (*aere dato qui pingitur*, 21; 248–250, 382–384, 419–433). Fame, gaining and sustaining particular reputations, motivates poets, critics, and audiences (112–113, 153–157, 464–466). On this basis, the position of the poet-critic is constantly negotiated and renegotiated in reference to the addressees, who are among the rich and influential in Roman society. At various times the speaker assumes the role of a sympathetic fellow poet (9–11, 24–31), then a poet defending his own work (55–72, 234–243), then the objective but hard critic (12–23, 32–37, 86–88, 188, 251–274, 323–332), then a rather pedantic teacher of his craft (38–53, 73–284, 309–322), then a fatherly mentor (6–9, 128–135, 285–294, 366–369, 385–390)—not to exhaust the possibilities. Restricting each role to specific verses is too precise. It gives the impression that these categories are clearly delineated; rather, Horace changes among them rapidly, often with seamless transitions, so that it is difficult to distinguish one mask and its impression from another. The shifting dynamics between speaker and audience, and the careful manipulation of societal role-playing that it implies, creates much of the interpretive space not only for the *Ars* but for Horatian poetry in general.[47] And the different roles Horace, the poet-critic, models show that writing, teaching, and learning poetry are socio-cultural activities.

We are, however, allowed to peek behind the masks, because Horace's criticism puts on display, but not too prominently, some of his own poetry. He like his bad painter has some feathers out of place. He covers himself in swan's feathers to illustrate his immortal lyric achievement

---

notions can only be represented by these particulars, nevertheless everything should be expounded with reference to the general principle, not to the enumerated particulars" (Phld. *On Poetry* V. xxx.25–33; Armstrong, 1993: 222).

[47] Brink (1963: 215) casts Horace in his *Ars* as an inactive poet looking in on poetry from the outside (*nil scribens ipse docebo*, 306b). In short, he writes as himself, the older poet. I agree that Horace from the opening address on writes as a seasoned poet to the less experienced. The number of self-references and the obvious echoes of his own poetry (see *infra*) lead to the assumption that he *ispe* is speaking. It is hard then to imagine Horace "looking at poetry from without," since at various points he identifies himself with the community of poets (e.g., 9b–11). As usual, even when Horace gives the impression that he is the speaker, placing a label on him is tricky, and it cannot be taken for granted that all that is said is what the "real Horace" believes; cf. Hardison and Golden, 1995: 30–31.

(… *nascunturque leves / per digitos umerosque plumae*, *C.* II.20.11–12), a metamorphosis sometimes considered to be a grotesque, and later he feathers Ligurinus' beardless face to warn this obstinate young beloved that some day the youth will lose his smooth cheeks to an old man's prickly beard (*C.* IV.10). Such a novel use for feathers prompts Bentley to emend (*pluma*) to "bruma" (winter / old age will sneak up on the boy). A bad painter dares to spice up his woods by adding in some dolphins (*qui variare cupit rem prodigialiter unam, / delphinum silvis appingit, fluctibus aprum*, *Ars* 29–30), and Horace had hung up some fish in trees (*piscium et summa genus haesit ulmo*, *C.* I.2.9). His Sybaris is so love sick for Lydia that the young man steps out of character, abandons the Campus and forfeits his heroic athletics (*imberbis iuvenis … / gaudet equis canibusque et aprici gramine Campi*, *Ars* 161–162; cf. [Sybaris] *cur apricum / deserit Campum patiens pulveris atque solis?*, *C.* I.8.3b–4). All of these particular cross-references occur in the context of Horace schooling the artist on the limits of decorum and the necessity for unity. Should we justify Horatian invention in these cases?[48]

If I were the bad painter or mad poet, my answer would include some "Horace on Horace." Faced with a critical audience, a poet could lose all nerve and let his poetry creep across the ground (*sectantem levia nervi / deficiunt animique … / serpit humi tutus nimium timidusque procellae*, *Ars* 26b–28), which is how Horace's hexameter verse is characterized (*sine nervis altera quidquid / composui pars esse putat*, *S.* II.1.2b–3a; *nec sermones ego mallem / repentis per humum quam res componere gestas*, *Epist.* II.1.250b–251). Then again, his lyre can swell with grand strains (*professus grandia turget*, *Ars* 27b; *nil parvum aut humili modo, / nil mortale loquar. dulce periculum est, / o Lenaee, sequi deum*, *C.* III.25.17–19) and revel in frenzied Bacchic inspiration (*C.* II.19.1–8). Other times he protests he is too small for a topic. Then again, the "humble" *recusatio* from a more negative view can be read as a polite way of going on too long (e.g., *in publica commoda peccem, / si longo sermone morer tua tempora, Caesar*, *Epist.* II.1.3b–4, followed by over two hundred-sixty lines of verse), and in this sense Horace could be the bear-leech grabbing on

[48] Only Horace uses *pluma* for a man's beard. I defended his creativity (2004b: 255–256 nn.22, 24) because "feathers" associates Ligurinus with a kingly legendary past. The Ligurians were known for being tough (Cic. *Agr.* 2.95; Liv. 5.35; 22.33; 27.39; n.b. Diod. Sic. 5.39), but their king Cyncus, while he wept by the River Po for his lost lover Phaethon, was changed into a swan. Ligurinus should be more like the tender-hearted king and accept the singer's love while there is time. Am I correct or should we follow Bentley's lead and emend to spare Horace an infelicity?

and refusing to let go.[49] Such complicity between Horace and the artists he critiques eventually leads to the accusation that he shares in the poetic madness.

I do not think that Horace would object. When he includes his own poetry and himself in his criticism, he lends his poetics an introspective quality and baits those he criticizes and his audience at large to judge his poetry good or bad. Accordingly, the poet-critic is sensitive and defends his own practice (*Ars* 55–59). In doing so, he acknowledges that he is open for questioning. Like an iambist he is subject to his own criticism, and as such he is not an artist who insists on absolute domination over his art.[50] The *Ars Poetica*, therefore, cannot be reduced to a straightforward explication of Horace's rules and regulations for poetry. This *Ars* replicates what it demands that art be: an experience realized when artist/s and audience/s cross into each other's space. The whole of art never consists in the elements, painted on a canvas, written on a page, or carved in marble. It *trans*pires through the multiple senses of all participants.

It follows that Horace's poetic is sensual, in particular visual. The *Ars Poetica* privileges sight over hearing, links closely poetic composition and the visual arts, and saves the fullest treatment for drama and tragedy. The overall effect proves pictorial as the poem about poetics becomes the very model or image of the art. Horace's poetry becomes vision.[51] The result achieved is a clever and careful muting of the didacticism customary in rhetorical treatises and handbooks. The visual arts are not so burdened

---

[49] These references to Horace's previous poetry are indicative not exhaustive, and they lend the whole *Ars* an introspective quality so strong that it is common to identify Horace with the mad poet in various degrees. For example, the *Ars* contains critique of the satirist's art (Fiske: 1920: 89, 446–447); Brink (1971: 516), who argues that Horace in his *Ars* views poetry from the outside, with the finale places Horace inside the hole ("It fascinates because it is written from inside the experience which it professes to ridicule."); see also Oliensis (1998: 219–220) on the mad poet and his connections with Horace's satiric "self-deprecation."

[50] Consider Rudd's questions (1989: 36): "After reading the *AP* and trying to appreciate its qualities we can do one other thing—we can question it. For example, why should an artist not produce grotesques? Granted, Vitruvius disliked them (7.5.3–4), but medieval stone-masons and illuminators thought otherwise. Must art imitate nature? Not according to the painters of Byzantium, nor to Matisse and Picasso. 'Know your limitations.' Why? Is not this a depressingly safe counsel? ('Ah, but a man's reach should exceed his grasp, / Or what's a heaven for?'—Browning)."

[51] Principles on dramatic composition consume nearly one third of the *Ars* (153–294), excluding other exempla drawn from the stage. It is assumed that one of the Pisones was planning to write a play, most likely a tragedy. This is a reasonable hypothesis (119–130), but also the physics of vision in Horace's poetics means that it is logical for him to spend

with the didactic. When looking at a painting or statue, few ever pause to ask, "But what does it teach?", or even "But what is it for?". An assumed primary function for the visual arts is the pleasure derived from their inherent sweetness and from simply possessing them.[52] Horace goes further and concedes that while utility helps win an audience and sell books, a poem's ability to move an audience resides in its sweetness (333–346), which in this *Ars* cannot be located exclusively in technical perfection alone, the poet's genius, or the expectations of the audience any more than society can exist from the individualized voice. The whole is always more than the sum of its single elements. Song is fusion, and thus Horace's literary criticism overlaps with his iambic criticism. Both require negotiating tensions (transgression and responsion), which may not always satisfy the powerful or the pedantic, but does make for good poetry and society—*animosque secutus / Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben*. Thus, just as Horace claims, his conception of iambic and poetics in general opposes the monolithic stance he assigns to the Archilochean-Lykambid tradition. His iambic commentary (*Epist.* I.19) looks both to his own past and present. His reputation for invective (*Satires*, *Epodes*) communicates his contempt toward literary mimes, while his defense for his own work speaks against selling out poetry to any solitary preconception.

The Value of Criticism: Artistic and Social Cohesion

*Quintilius: The Necessity of Constructive Criticism (*Ars Poetica *419–452)*

Horace is a stereotypical artist in one way: he is sensitive to criticism. Early in his career he took exception to critics whose poetics he did not value and named them (*S.* I.10.78–80). Poetasters do not make good critics (*Epist.* I.19.35–49). The poignancy of his attacks on critics, made toward the end of his career, reflects the loss of those he valued most and also named (*S.* I.10.40–45, 81–90; also Albius Tibullus [?], *candide iudex*, *Epist.* I.4.1). After the deaths of Vergil, Tibullus (19 BC),

---

as much time on drama as he does. Drama activates all the senses, and Horace does not split the sense perception involved in one art form from that of another. Cf. Armstrong (1993: 195–199, 220–230): Horace's *Ars* very literally pictures a type of Epicurean poetics.

[52] Although Aeneas does not understand the scenes Vulcan crafts onto the shield Venus gives to him, he appreciates and admires its beauty (*Talia per clipeum Volcani, dona parentis, / miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet / attollens umero famamque et fata nepotum.*, Verg. *A.* 8.729–731).

and Varius a short time later, Horace was the grand survivor of his literary peer group, and it is not flattering, but outright irritating, for any older established artist to be imitated and criticized poorly by a set of younger no account poets.[53] Nonetheless, Horace's willingness to engage criticism always depended on the quality of the critics and their motivation. In this regard the *Ars* does not leave us wondering. It gives details for one positive model: Vergil's and Horace's friend Quintilius is described as the quintessential critic (*C.* I.24; *sodes*, *Ars* 438). Every artist needs a Quintilius.

Horace defines Quintilius' criticism as pressure combined with cooperative exchange (*Ars* 438–452). The poet's and the critic's stylus strike out (*delere iubebat*, 440b; *incomptis allinet atrum / traverso calamo signum*, 446b–447a). Quintilius directs the poet to be a blacksmith, standing over the anvil hammering and sharpening (*et male tornatos incudi reddere versus*, 441). The critic picks up the knife and cuts back (*ambitiosa recidet / ornamenta*, 447b–448a). Quintilius forces the artist to shine a floodlight on the work (*parum claris lucem dare coget*, 448b). All of this mechanical labor by poet and critic working in conjunction is performed within relationship (*sodes*, 438; *amicum*, 450). Conversation is required. The artist and critic talk back and forth (438–444). The author starts first. He reads his work to Quintilius. Quintilius marks points for improvement. The artist tries two, three times, to make the corrections, and he complains that he lacks the skill to meet the critic's demands. The critic presses the artist to continue editing. Or the artist comes back and defends his choices. Once artist and critic have shared their own interests, likes and dislikes, opposing perspectives, Quintilius allows the artist in the areas of the artist's choice to step back respectfully and agree to disagree (443–444). The art that results from such a process is no longer the creation of an individual standing alone. The work is shared, but maintains the value and role of each participant. In essence, Quintilius practices criticism as an act of responsion. This is what makes him a critic worth hearing, and he is willing to engage the artist at this level because he understands what is at stake:

> … nec dicet 'cur ego amicum
> offendam in nugis?' hae nugae seria ducent
> in mala derisum semel exceptumque sinistre. (450–452)

[53] In general, Horace's response to his detractors depends more on his arguments for what poetry should be and do (cf. Feeney, 2002: 174–183; 2009: 37–38).

> And he will not say, "Why should I offend a friend over such trifles?" These trifles will cause serious trouble, once he has been mocked and his work received badly.

Any artist, who opts to go it alone without a Quintilius to join him in the creative process, can end up being a bad painter or mad poet.

The Death of Vergil's Quintilius: Criticism As Comfort (*C.* *I.24)*

Quintilius, silenced, would be a momentous loss for a poet:

> Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus
> tam cari capitis? praecipe lugubris
> cantus, Melpomene, cui liquidam pater
> vocem cum cithara dedit.
>
> ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor
> urget: cui Pudor et Iustitiae soror,
> incorrupta Fides nudaque Veritas
> quando ullum inveniet parem?
>
> multis ille bonis flebilis occidit,
> nulli flebilior quam tibi, Vergili.
> tu frustra pius, heu, non ita creditum
> poscis Quintilium deos.
>
> quid si Threicio blandius Orpheo
> auditam moderere arboribus fidem?
> num vanae redeat sanguis imagini
> quam virga semel horrida,
>
> non lenis precibus fata recludere,
> nigro compulerit Mercurius gregi?
> durum. sed levius fit patientia
> quicquid corrigere est nefas. (*C.* I.24)
>
> How should grief be respectable and measured, when so dear a life is lost? Prescribe a mourning song, Melpomene, blessed by father with lyre and lovely voice. It is true then, everlasting sleep covers Quintilius. Will Propriety and sincere Faithfulness, the sister of Justice, and naked Truth ever find anyone equal to him? He died, and many, good they are, deem it right to mourn; no one mourns more than you, Vergil. You pious in vain, alas, beg the gods to return Quintilius, although he was not loaned to you on such terms. What if you could play with more charm than Thracian Orpheus the lyre which could bend the ears of the trees? Would blood return to the empty shade, once Mercury, not gracious to unlock the fates on account of our prayers, has gathered it to the gloomy herd? No. Hard. But resolve makes lighter what mortals are forbidden to correct.

It is held without dispute that Quintilius' admirable character merits lament and that his death profoundly affected his friend Vergil in particular.[54] It is also generally agreed that the lament (*lugrubis* / *cantus*) Horace requests from Melpomene immediately follows in the rest of the poem, which in turn implies that the song is designed to be a tribute for Quintilius and a consolation for his mourners.[55] Consolation in this instance does not imply "soft and sweet." Horace's lament is not entirely comfortable. He leaves the leading question open enough that it can be interpreted both as high praise for Quintilius (his life was so precious that no amount of grief will do him justice) and as counsel for Vergil that his elegiac weeping, imitated in the assonance of *multis* … *bonis flebilis* … *nulli flebilior* (9–10a), exceeds acceptable and healthy standards.[56] "What propriety in grief honors Quintilius?" Practicing decorum (*pudor aut modus*, 1b) would reflect his character, unequalled in that virtue (*cui Pudor* … / *quando ullum inveniet parem?*, 6b–8). Horace ends hard (*durum*, 19) and instructs Vergil that he can only find relief by patiently giving way to the will of the fates (*sed levius fit patientia* / *quidquid*

[54] Any confusion of this Quintilius with the jurist P. Alfenus Varus is incidental (see N.-H., 1970: 279). Horace's description of Quintilius' character and the practices of the critic Quintilius correspond closely (c.24.6–8; *Ars* 445–452), and therefore the consensus is that they are the same person. N.-H. recommend Alfenus as the Varus of *C.* I.18; consider, however, the last verse, *arcanique Fides prodiga, perlucidior vitro*. Most likely, then, c.18 and 24 are both addressed to Quintilius Varus, associated along with Vergil with the Epicurean school at Naples, and with Siro and Philodemus (Serv. ad *Ecl.* 6.13; Philodemus addressed *On Flattery* and *On Death* to Plotius Tucca, Varius Rufus, Vergilius Maro, and Quintilius Varus [*P. Herc.* 1082; *P. Herc.* 253; *P. Herc. Paris* 2]; see Körte, 1890: 172–177; Armstrong, 2004: 1–22, reviews the evidence as it now stands). Philodemus was supported by L. Calpurnius Piso, whose villa at Herculaneum housed the charred papyri now often our best source for the philosopher's writings.

[55] Although Horace's appeal to Melpomene, the tragic Muse, suits the context of a lament, the precise spheres of the Muses were not yet settled (N.-H., 1970: 282–283). Horace names Melpomene in two other lyrics, both announcing his vatic status (*C.* III.30; IV.3), and the Muses in Horace, both named and unnamed, are general witnesses to his lyric prowess; cf. Verrall's "Melpomene and pathos in Horace" (his 1884 study opens with a chapter on the Muse). For the technique of a song being or representing the act suggested in its opening, such as a party or choral performance, see Williams on *epode* 9 (1968: 215–216) and Cairns on *C.* I.21 and IV.6 (1971: 440–444).

[56] "Elegiac" is not exaggerated. Compare the repeated "f" in Lydia's tears and raging lust (*flebis* … *bacchante* … *flagrans* … *furiare*, *C.* I.25.10–14) and the lover's curse against Lyce (*C.* IV.13); cf. Propertius' *exclusa amatrix* (3.25.6b–7: *Cynthia, flere soles.* / *flebo ego discedens, sed fletum inuria vincit*). Khan (1967: 107–117) speculates that Horace's lament responds to an elegy Vergil composed for Quintilius' death.

corrigere est nefas, 19b–20). Death is immutable. No one gets out of life alive. Quintilius' death imposes limits that Vergil cannot breach with his own tears and song.

Horace makes this point by singing back to his fellow poet Vergil's verses retouched. Horace, *consolator*, also turns out to be the critic. First, he restricts the efficacy of piety ("You in vain pious," *tu frustra pius*, 11); then he sighs (*heu*). The pause, to inhale and exhale, gives just enough time to sense the hurt that this phrase may have elicited from the poet at work composing the epic of the pious Aeneas. Second, he serves notice to Vergil in commercial terms that the gods do not owe Quintilius back to Vergil like a passenger on a ship (… *non ita creditum / poscis Quintilium deos*., 11–12; cf. Horace's propemptikon for Vergil, *C*. I.3: *navis, quae tibi creditum / debes Vergilium*, 5–6a). The last ode to Vergil (*C*. IV.12) continues the mercantile vocabulary. Horace invites Vergil over to his house for a drinking-party and insists that his friend set aside the profiteering that might delay him (*rerum pone moras et studium lucri*, *C*. IV.12.25). Writing for profit is a standard charge Horace levels against epicists, the most notorious example being Choerilus, whose droning verses would put old Homer to sleep.[57] Then, within the lament of c.24, Horace calls to account Vergil's majestic and epic-styled prediction of the "golden age" (ecl. 4) by rewriting Vergil's boast that he can sing with Orpheus (*non me carminibus vincet nec Thracius Orpheus*, ecl. 4.55) into a question of futility, "What if you can outsing Orpheus?" (*quid si Threicio blandius Orpheo / auditam moderere arboribus fidem?*, 13–14). Vergil may sing with Orphic skill, but this does not come with the power to journey into the underworld in hopes of retrieving a beloved, and Quintilius is not the heroic character Aeneas, who can enter the underworld and then return again. For the *coup de grâce*, Horace directs a *consolatio* from the *Aeneid* back at its own storyteller. While Aeneas was celebrating the funeral games to honor his father, the frenzied Trojan women torched the ships to prevent Aeneas from leaving the friendly home they had found in Sicily. Aeneas and his men managed to save some of the ships, but Aeneas in his bitterness nearly decided not to sail on. Nautes consoled him, telling him whatever fortune he would face must be overcome by endurance (*quidquid erit, superanda omnis fortuna ferendo est*, *A*. 5.710).

[57] *Epist*. II.1.229–244, *Ars* 355–360; see also my review of Horace's epic criticism and *Vergilius est poeta* in *C*. IV.12 (2004b: 14–26, 158–166). Horace makes clear that Vergil and Varius are not like Choerilus, *Epist*. II.1.245–250.

Now Horace tells Vergil that grief is hard, but patience makes lighter whatever cannot be changed (*durum. sed levius fit patientia / quidquid corrigere est nefas.*, 24.19–20).[58]

Vergil's vatic mythmaking may construct its own reality; it is not real life. Ships set sail and many times do not return or reach their destination. The truth is friends die. However immortal Vergil may represent his poetry to be, his song is not omnipotent. Horace, as is his practice, is blending life with poetics. He, through his own sense of propriety (*Pudor*), refuses epic and keeps his song light (*leves*):

nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere nec gravem
Pelidae stomachum cedere nescii
nec cursus duplicis per mare Ulixei
  nec saevam Pelopis domum

conamur, tenues grandia, dum Pudor
imbellisque lyrae Musa potens vetat
laudes egregii Caesaris et tuas
  culpa deterere ingeni.

nos convivia, nos proelia virginum
sectis in iuvenes unguibus acrium
cantamus, vacui sive quid urimur,
  non praeter solitum leves. (*C.* I.6.5–12, 17–20)

I, Agrippa, do not strive to sing of such deeds, nor of enraged Achilles heedless in giving way, nor of wily Ulysses' wanderings over the sea, nor of the grim house of Pelops, I too slight for grand themes, since Propriety and the Muse, the potentate of peace's lyre, order that I not cheapen by my low talent excellent Caesar's praise or yours.

I sing of feasts, I sing of battles, fierce girls with their sharpened nails fighting the boys; unattached or burning for some lover, as usual, I keep it light.

[58] We do not know the exact date Quintilius died. Jerome records 23/22 BC, which too conveniently corresponds to the traditional publication date for *Odes* I–III. And there is no way to determine where Vergil was in the writing of the *Aeneid* or how much Horace had heard at the time of Quintilius' death. The limits Horace places on piety and his critique of the heroic *katabasis* fit general plot outlines for the *Aeneid*. His imitation of Nautes requires that he knew more detail, and consequently is less certain. In spite of Nisbet's and Hubbard's skepticism (1970: 289), I am more willing—given the general nature of Horace's criticisms here—to trust Donatus' report that a favorite saying of Vergil lies behind Nautes' advice: "(Vergilius) solitus erat dicere nullam virtutem commodiorem homini esse patientia, ac nullam adeo asperam esse fortunam quam prudenter patiendo vir fortis non vincat" (Wickham, 1874: *praef.*; Diehl, 1911: 36).

It is only by adhering to the boundaries imposed on mortals that Vergil can make what is hard lighter (*durum. / sed levius*, 19a). Epic is not the answer to Horace's opening question, "How can grief be measured well, when so dear a life is lost?".[59] Neither epic, nor the mysticism of Orpheus for that matter, fits life's parameters.[60] What sort of comfort is this that treats Vergil to modified bits of his poetry, dished back to him as literary-social criticism?[61] "Perhaps, Vergil, your lament could use some restraint, like some of your poetry. Accepting human limitations is hard, but it is part of life, death, and artistry." This advice matches up with the poet-critic's more formal instruction to his young understudy:

> Sumite materiam vestris, qui scribitis, aequam
> viribus et versate diu quid ferre recusent,
> quid valeant umeri (*Ars* 38–40a)
>
> If you fancy writing, take up material equal to your strength and mull over for a good while what load your shoulders refuse and what they can lift.

Horace praying Melpomene for the right words to say and then joining his song with Vergil's tears contradict the notion that the *consolatio* too lightly veils a literary tease.[62] *C.* I.24 has emotive depth, but experiencing the tenderness in Horace's consolation without diminishing its power necessitates abandoning the supposition that criticism must be polemic.

---

[59] Horace's repetition *modus*: *moderere … fidem* (vv.1, 14) brings out the dual meanings of the words (*modus* = "proper measure" or "verse"; *moderor* = "control" or "play" the lyre).

[60] Horace's view underlines the anti-heroics in Homer's *Iliad*. Achilles gains the strength to redirect his rage, when he disregards the violation against his own *kleos* and risks his life to redeem his friend's. It is interesting that Vergil's Aeneas follows suit, bending his interests for the sake of the larger community, the foundation of Rome. Vergil and Horace end up on the same page.

[61] W.S. Landor's Boccaccio (*Pentameron* 4): "What man on such an occasion is at leisure to amuse himself with the little plaster images of *Pudor* and *Fides*, of *Justitia* and *Veritas*, or disposed to make a comparison of Vergil and Orpheus?"; others entertain the same question less bluntly (Commager, 1962: 289; Khan, 1967: 107–117; N.-H., 1970: 281; Syndikus, 1972: 242–243; Santirocco, 1986: 58–59; Lowrie, 1997: 91–92). R. Thomas (2001: 62), however, is as blunt: "Nor is the substance of the message to Virgil one particularly suggestive of friendship or even proximity: the death of Quintilius shows the futility of Virgil's *pietas*. Whether or not that refers to the prominence and function of *pietas* in the forthcoming *Aeneid*, there is no particular warmth or consolation here." It can be debated whether or not Vergil and Horace were "chummy," but Horace's praise and laments for Vergil (*C.* I.3; IV.10; 12) so develop the language of *animae dimidium meae* that Vergil becomes Horace's poetic complement: the poets are two halves, different yet comprising a whole (see on *C.* IV.10, Johnson, 2004b: 138–145). Criticism is not always polemic, nor, when exchanged by friends, must it always be light-hearted banter.

[62] West (1995: 112–115) defends well the song's compassion.

The tension imposed on the song by opposing criticism and comfort can also be eased by bringing them into correspondence.[63] In order for Vergil to move beyond the death of Quintilius (his close friend and valued critic), he must find a way to access resources other than his own tears and song. When Horace assumes Quintilius' role as critic, he transgresses into Vergil's pain and despair and with his interactions assures Vergil that he can withstand a "critical" loss (*ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor / urget*, 5–6a), because he can continue sharing song with another, *carmen perpetuum*.[64] Criticism translates into listening and understanding. Horace, therefore, neither belittles Quintilius' worth nor Vergil's pain by reducing death to soothing platitudes. His criticism comforts Vergil on a very real and practical level by giving back to him the full voice needed to perfect his song.[65] Horace's and Vergil's music together have the power to do what Vergil's solo could not—break through the separation caused by death, and in this sense the responsion in Horace's criticism provides *con*solation through *societas*. Every person, whoever reads this lament aloud, must cry with Vergil (*multis … bonis flebilis … nulli flebilior … tibi*).

---

[63] Putnam recognizes (1993:123–135; 2006: 101–106) that Horace's *epicedium / consolatio* admonishes Vergil to acknowledge his limitations in life and in verse. He also argues that Horace represents immortality as poetic exchange. I would push Putnam a little further. The criticism is the *consolatio*. We should measure fully the pleasure, and therefore respite, Vergil would take in interacting with another poet who understands his work at the highest level and is prepared to match wits (Calvus and Catullus, Cat. 50). Catullus runs throughout *C.* I.24 (Putnam, 2006: 101–106): *perpetuus sopor* (v.5), cf. *nox est perpetua una dormienda* (Cat. 5.6); *tam cari capitis* (v.2), cf. *tam carum … caput … cano … capiti* (Cat. 68.119–124); *Quis desiderio* (v.1), cf. Catullus' *consolatio* for Calvus upon the death of his wife Quintilia (*quo desiderio*, Cat. 96.3); *Fides … inveniet* (vv.7–8), cf. *fides … invenies* (Cat. 102.2–3).

[64] I am invoking Ovid: *In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas / corpora; di, coeptis (nam vos mutastis et illas) / adspirate meis primaque ab origine mundi / ad mea perpetuum deducite tempora carmen!*, *Met.* 1.1–4. Ovid writes an intriguing new type of episodic epic into a whole (*perpetuum*); he uses song to transgress between opposing dimensions and times, and thereby creates a brand new type of shared reality, a process rightly designated everlasting (*perpetuum*). If Ovid had Horace's advice in the back of his mind (*Sumite materiam vestris … aequam / viribus et versate diu quid ferre … valeant umeri*, *Ars* 38–40a), he has the boldness to declare himself up to the task (*In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas / corpora*, 1–2a).

[65] Putnam, 1993: 134, notes that Horace's *corrigere* (*C.* I.24.20) is spoken by Quintilius (*corrige*, *Ars* 438). The comfort in Horace's criticism comes full circle. Horace adds his voice to Vergil's to console his friend over the loss of Quintilius (c.24) and later adds Vergil's song to his own to console himself over Vergil's death (c.12). Such is the perpetual power of song. The tone of lament in *C.* IV.12 indicates that it was likely composed after Vergil's death.

This is Horace's spell (*carmen*), his poetic dance:

ἴτε, τᾷ περὶ παρθένῳ
Δηοῖ θυμωσαμένᾳ
λύπαν ἐξαλλάξατ' ἀλαλᾷ,
Μοῦσαί θ' ὕμνοισι χορῶν. (Eur. *Helen* 1342–1345)

Go, holy Graces, go drive out the pain of Demeter's resentment over her maiden daughter with the shrill cry; and you, Muses, with song and dance.[66]

Singing, forming together multiple, and in the case of iambic, disparate voices, counteracts pain and anger; and Horace's criticism finds immortality in the expression of the plural, even in the bitter tears of the mourning song. Re/cantation, "a singing back and forth," conjures a stronger *carmen* than witchy Canidia's in/cantation. The value of Horace's criticism, iambic and literary, lies in his poetry's power to model and effect social cohesion. When he brings iambic into Roman society without degrading its ritual power, he envalues his art because it offers its participants essentially a festive space.

[66] See also at the head of Chapter 1.

AN IAMBIC POST-LUDE

That "historic" courthouse, with its *Lady Justice* statue, within sight of which my own social criticisms were fabricated, is not what I thought it was (see A Personal Introduction). The entire bottom story is brick-backup with sandstone veneer, a commonplace technique for such construction. The grand clock-tower is pressed metal painted white, *faux* stone. Its two halves stand forever apart, locked against each other, the grotesque bottom overpowering its slender pinnacle: an architectural mismatch. *Lady Justice*, only cheap sheet metal, is hollow. Since I am in the middle of middle-age, I am nearly mad enough to tear down that structure, but I suspect I would create the most harm, as Horace might put it, if I were to indulge my anger and refuse to take a hard look at the limited and therefore false markers of my own invention. The so-called "lesser" poetic forms (epigrammatic, elegiac, lyric, and iambic) become weighty because they force us out of familiar perspectives, and when we become willing with their help to crawl out of our (w)hole, we discover that there are others waiting with rescue-ropes in hand, wondering in the name of heaven when we would ever find the sense to pull our head out of our own *ars*(e).

WORKS CITED

Commentaries, Concordances, Dictionaries, Editions, Lexica, Translations

Bentley, R., ed. (1711) *Q. Horatius Flaccus, ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus Richardi Bentleii* (Leipzig); 3rd ed. reprint (New York, 1978).

Bernabé, A. (1996) *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta, Pars I*. 2nd ed. (Stuttgart; Leipzig).

Borzsák, S., ed. (1984) *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Leipzig).

Brink, C.O. (1963) *Horace On Poetry I: Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles* (Cambridge).

———. (1971) *Horace on Poetry II: The Ars Poetica* (Cambridge).

———. (1982) *Horace on Poetry III: Epistles Book II* (Cambridge).

Campbell, A.Y., ed. (1945) *Q. Horati Flacci Carmina cum Epodis* (London).

Cávarzere, A., ed. (1992) *Orazio: il libro degli Epodi* (Venice).

Clausen, W. (1994) *A Commentary on Virgil: Eclogues* (Oxford).

Degani, H., ed. (1983) *Hipponax: Testimonia et Fragmenta* (Stuttgart).

Diehl, E., ed. (1911) *Die Vitae Vergilianae und ihre antiken Quellen* (Bonn).

Diels, H., ed. (1934–1937) *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, griechisch und deutsch*; 5th ed. rev. W. Kranz (Berlin).

Dodds, E.R., ed. (1944) *Euripides: Bacchae* (Oxford); 2nd ed. (1960).

Ellis, R. (1889) *A Commentary on Catullus*. 2nd ed. (Oxford).

Foley, H.P., ed. (1994) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretive Essays* (Princeton).

Friedrich, G., ed. (1908) *Catulli Veronensis liber* (Leipzig; Berlin).

Garrison, D.H. (1991) *Horace: Epodes and Odes, A New Annotated Latin Edition* (Norman, OK).

Gerber, D.E. (1999) *Greek Iambic Poetry: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC* (Cambridge, MA).

Giarratano, L., ed. (1930) *Q. Orazio Flacco: Il libro degli Epodi* (Torino).

Haupt, M., ed. (1852) *Q. Horatii Flacci. Opera* (Leipzig); 3rd ed. (1871).

Heinsius, D., ed. (1612) *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (London).

Hercher, R. (1864; 1866) *Claudii Aeliani De natura animalium libri XVII, Varia historia, Epistolae fragmenta*. 2 vols. (Leipzig).

How, W.W. and Wells, J., edd. (1912) *A Commentary on Herodotus* (Oxford).

Keil, H., ed. (1855–1880) *Grammatici Latini, ex recensione Henrici Keilii*. 8 vols. (Leipzig); reprint (Hildesheim, 1961).

Keller, O., and Holder, A., edd. (1899) *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Leipzig).

Kiessling, A., ed. (1884) *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Berlin); *Oden und Epoden*. vol. 1, 9th ed. rev. Heinze (1958); *Satiren*. vol. 2, 6th ed. (1957); *Briefe*. vol. 3, 5th ed. (1957).

Konstan, D., et al. (1988) *Philodemus On Frank Criticism: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Society of Biblical Literature, Texts and Translations 43, Graeco-Roman 13 (Atlanta, GA).
Körte, A., ed. (1890) *Metrodori Epicuri Fragmenta* (Leipzig).
Lambinus, D., ed. (1561) *Q. Horatius Flaccus, Ex fide atque auctoritate decem librorum manu scriptorium, opera Dionys. Lambini Montroliensis emendatus: ab eodemque commentaries copiosissimus illustratus, nunc primum in lucem editus* (Lyon); 6th ed. (1605).
Mankin, D. (1995) *Horace: Epodes* (Cambridge).
Markland, J. (1723) *Epistola critica ad eruditissimum virum Franciscum Hare S.T.P., decanum Vigorniensem: in qua Horatii loca aliquot et aliorum veterum emendantur* (Cantabrigiae).
Marshall, P.K., ed. (1977) *Cornelii Nepotis Vitae Cum Fragmentis* (Leipzig).
Maurach, G. (2001) *Horaz: Werk und Leben* (Heidelberg).
Maurenbrecher, B., ed. (1891) *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum Reliquiae* (Leipzig).
Mayer, R. (1994) *Horace: Epistles I* (Cambridge).
McKeown, J.C. (1987) *Ovid: Amores: Text. Prolegomena and Commentary in Four Volumes* (Leeds).
Meineke, J., ed. (1834) *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Berlin).
Merrill, E.T., ed. (1893) *Catullus* (Cambridge, MA).
Mitscherlich, C.W. (1800) *Q. Horatii Flacci Opera*. 2 vols. (Leipzig).
Morris, E. (1939) *Horace: Satires and Epistles* (New York); reprint (Norman, OK, 1967).
Müller, L., ed. (1869) *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Leipzig).
Nisbet, R.G.M., and Hubbard, M. (1970) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I* (Oxford).
———. (1978) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II* (Oxford).
———, and Rudd, N. (2004) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III* (Oxford).
Olivier, F., ed. (1917) *Les Épodes d'Horace* (Lausanne).
Orelli, J.C., ed. (1837–1838) *Q. Horatius Flaccus*. 2 vols. (Turici); 3rd ed. rev. I.G. Baiter (1850–1852); 4th ed. rev. Hirschfelder (1886).
Page, D. (1955) *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry* (Oxford).
Page, T.E., ed. (1883) *Q. Horatii Flacci: Carminum Libri IV, Epodon Liber* (London); 1895 rev. ed. reprint (New York, 1977).
Perret, J. (1964) *Horace*. trans. Bertha Humez (New York).
Plüss, T. (1904) *Das Jambenbuch des Horaz im lichte der eigenen und unserer Zeit* (Leipzig).
Quinn, K., ed. (1980) *Horace: The Odes* (London).
Richardson, L. Jr. (1992) *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore).
Richardson, N.J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford).
Ritter, F., ed. (1856–1857) *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Leipzig).
Rostagni, A. (1930) *Arte Poetica di Orazio* (Torino).
Rudd, N. (1966) *The Satires of Horace* (Cambridge).
———. (1989) *Horace: Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones* ('Ars Poetica') (Cambridge).

Schoonhoven, H., ed. (1980) *Elegiae in Maecenatem: Prolegomena, Text and Commentary* (Groningen).
Schütz, H., ed. (1874–1883) *Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Berlin); *Oden und Epoden*, vol. 1 (1874); *Satiren*, vol. 2 (1881); *Episteln*, vol. 3 (1883).
Shackleton Bailey, D.R., ed. (1985) *Q. Horati Flacci Opera* (Stuttgart); 4th ed. (Leipzig, 2001).
Sider, D., ed. (1997) *The Epigrams of Philodemos: Introduction, Text, and Commentary* (Oxford).
Syndikus, H.P. (1972) *Die Lyrik Des Horaz, Eine Interpretation der Oden: Band I, Erstes und zwietes Buch* (Darmstadt).
———. (1973) *Die Lyrik Des Horaz, Eine Interpretation der Oden: Band II, Drittes und viertes Buch* (Darmstadt).
Tarditi, G. (1968) *Archiloco. Introduzione, testimonianze sulla vita e sull' arte, testo critico, traduzione* (Rome).
Thomson, D.F.S., ed. (1997) *Catullus: Edited with a Textual and Interpretive Commentary* (Toronto); reprint (1998).
Vahlen, J. (1911; 1923) *Gesammelte Philologische Schriften* (Leipzig); *Schriften zur Wiener Zeit 1858–1874*, vol. 1 (1911); *Schriften der Berliner Zeit 1874–1911*, vol. 2 (1923).
Waterfield, R. (2002) *Phaedrus* (Oxford).
Watson, L.C. (2003) *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes* (Oxford).
West, M.L., ed. (1971; 1972) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*. 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon); 2nd ed. (1989; 1992).
———. (1973) *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford).
Wickham, E.C., ed. (1874; 1891) *Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia: The Works of Horace with a Commentary*. 2 vols. (Oxford); vol. 1, 3rd ed. rev. (1896).

Other References

Ableitinger-Grünberger, D. (1971) *Der junge Horaz und die Politik. Studien zur 7. und 16. Epode* (Heidelberg).
———, and Gugel, H., edd. (1970) *Festschrift Karl Vretska* (Heidelburg).
Abrahams, R.D., and Bauman, R. (1972) "Ranges of Festival Behavior," in B.A. Babcock (1972) 193–208.
Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002) *Polyeideia: The* Iambi *of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition* (Berkeley).
Adkin, N. (1985) "The Fathers on Laughter," *Orpheus* 6: 149–152.
Aloni, A. (2001) "What Is That Man Doing in Sappho, fr. 31 V.?," in Cávarzere, Aloni, and Barchiesi (2001) 29–40.
Alston, W.P. (2000) *Illocutionary Acts and Sentence Meaning* (Ithaca, NY).
Alvar Ezquerra, A. (1997) "Los epodos eróticos de Horacio y los inicios de la elegía latina," *EClás* 39.111: 7–26.
Ancona, R. (1994) *Time and the Erotic in Horace's Odes* (Durham, NC).
Anderson, W.S. (1966) "Horace, Carm. 1.14: What Kind of Ship?," *CP* 61: 84–98.
———. (1972) "The Form, Purpose, and Position of Horace's Satire I,8," *AJP* 93: 4–13.

——. (1984) "Ironic Preambles and Satiric Self-Definition in Horace *Satire* 2.1," *Pacific Coast Philology* 19: 35–42.
——. (1995) "*Horatius Liber*, Child and Freedman's Free Son," *Arethusa* 28: 151–164.
——. (1999) "The Secret of Lydia's Aging: Horace, Ode 1, 25," in Anderson, ed. *Why Horace? A Collection of Interpretations* (Wauconda, IL, 1999) 85–91.
Arkins, B. (1993) "The Cruel Joke of Venus: Horace as Love Poet," in Rudd (1993) 106–119.
Armstrong, D. (1989) *Horace* (New Haven, CT).
——. (1993) "The Addressees of the *Ars poetica*: Herculaneum, the Pisones, and Epicurean Protreptic," *MD* 31: 185–230.
——; Fish, J.; Johnston, P.A.; and Skinner, M.B., edd. (2004) *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans* (Austin, TX).
Arthur, M. (1977) "Politics and Pomegranates: An Interpretation of the Homeric Hymn to Demeter," *Arethusa* 10: 7–47.
Austin, J.L. (1962) *How To Do Things With Words* (Cambridge, MA).
Babcock, B.A., ed. (1972) *The Reversible World: Symbolic Inversion in Art and Society* (Ithaca. NY).
Babcock, C.L. (1966) "*Si Certus Intrarit Dolor*: A Reconsideration of Horace's Fifteenth Epode," *AJP* 87: 400–419.
——. (1974) "*Omne Militabitur Bellum*. The Language of Commitment in Epode 1," *CJ* 70: 14–31.
——. (1978) "Horace, Epodes 13: Some Comments on Language and Meaning," in Riechel (1978) 107–118.
Bakhtin, M.M. (1965) *Tvorchestvo Fransura Rable* (Moscow); trans. H. Iswolsky (1968) *Rabelais and His World* (Cambridge, MA: MIT).
——. (1979) *Ėstetika Slovesnogo Tvorchestva* (Moscow); trans. V.W. McGee; C. Emerson and M. Holquist, edd. (1986) *Speech Genre and Other Late Essays* (Austin, TX).
Barbalet, J.M. (1998) *Emotion, Social Theory, and Social Structure: A Macrosociological Approach* (Cambridge).
Barchiesi, A. (2001) "Horace and Iambos: The Poet as Literary Historian," in Cávarzere (2001) 141–164.
——. (2002) "Palingenre: Death, Rebirth and Horatian Iambos," in M. Paschalis (2002) 47–69.
——. (2006) "*Carmina*: *Odes* and *Carmen Saeculare*," published in S.J. Harrison (2007) 144–161. I would like to thank Professor Barchiesi for posting an advance copy of his contribution, presented as a Princeton/Stanford Working Paper in Classics.
——. (2009) "Final Difficulties in an Iambic Poet's Career: Epode 17," in M. Lowrie (2009) 232–246.
——. (2009b) "Lyric in Rome," in Budelmann (2009) 319–335.
Barra G. (1973) "L'amicizia tra Virgilio e Orazio," *Vichiana* 2: 22–50.
Bartels, C. (1973) "Die neunte Epode des Horaz als sympotisches Gedicht," *Hermes* 101: 282-313.
Barton, Charles K.B. (1999) *Getting Even: Revenge as a Form of Justice* (Chicago).

Barwick, K. (1944) "Zur Interpretation und Chronologie der 4. Ecloge des Vergil und der 16. und 7. Epode des Horaz," *Philologus* 96: 28–67.
Bascom, W. (1957) "The Myth-Ritual Theory," *Journal of American Folklore* 70: 103–114.
Batstone, W.W., and Tissol, G. (2005) *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature: Essays Presented to William S. Anderson on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (New York).
Beare, J.I. (1913) "The *Phaedrus*: Its Structure; the ἔρως Theme: Notes," *Hermathena* 39: 312–334.
Bell, S., and Nagy, H., edd. (2009) *New Perspectives on Etruria and Early Rome* (Madison, WI).
Ben-Zeʾev, A. *The Subtlety of Emotions* (Cambridge, MA: MIT).
Bertman, S. (1989) "The Ashes and the Flame: Passion and Aging in Classical Poetry," in Falkner and de Luce (1989) 157–171.
Bickel, E. (1949) "Catulli in Caesarem Carmina," *RhM* 93: 1–23.
Blanchot, M. (1948) *Le Très-Haut* (Paris).
———. (1962) *L'attente, L'oubli* (Paris).
———. (1969) *L'entretien infini* (Paris).
Blundell, M.W. (1989) *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies: A Study in Sophocles and Greek Ethics* (Cambridge).
Bond, R. (2009) "Horace's Political Journey," in Dominik, Garthwaite, and Roche (2009) 133–152.
Bonfante, L. (2009) "Some Thoughts on the Baubo Gesture in Classical Art," in Bell and Nagy (2009) 158–170.
Bowditch, P.L. (2001) *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage* (Berkeley).
Bowie, A.M. (1993) *Aristophanes: Myth, Ritual, and Comedy* (Cambridge).
Bowie, E.L. (2001) "Early Greek Iambic Poetry: The Importance of Narrative," in Cávarzere, Aloni, and Barchiesi (2001) 1–27.
Bowra, C.M. (1963) "The Two Palinodes of Stesichorus," *CR* n.s. 13: 245–252.
Boyle, A.J. (1973) "The Edict of Venus. An Interpretive Essay on Horace's Amatory Odes," *Ramus*: 163–188.
Branham, B.R., ed. (2002) *Bakhtin and the Classics* (Evanston, IL).
———. (2005) "The Poetics of Genre: Bakhtin, Menippus, Petronius," in Batstone and Tissol (2005) 113–138.
Braund, D., and Gill, C., edd. (2003) *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome. Studies in Honor of T.P. Wiseman* (Exeter).
Braund, S. (2004) "*Libertas* or *Licentia*? Freedom and Criticism in Roman Satire," in Sluiter and Rosen (2004) 409–428.
———, and Most, G.W., edd. (2004) *Ancient Anger: Perspectives from Homer to Galen. Yale Classical Studies* 32 (New Haven, CT).
Bremmer, J.N. (1983) "Scapegoat Rituals in Ancient Greece," *HSCP* 87: 299–320.
———. (2007) "Greek Normative Animal Sacrifice," in Ogden (2007) 132–144.
Briggs, J. (1970) *Never in Anger: Portrait of an Eskimo Family* (Cambridge, MA).
Brink, C.O. (1982b) "Horatian Notes III: Despised Readings in the Manuscripts of the Epodes and a Passage of Odes Book 3," *PCPhS* n.s. 28: 30–56.
Brooks, R. (1999) *When Sorry Isn't Enough: The Controversy Over Apologies and Reparations for Human Injustice* (New York).

Brown, C. (1997) "Iambos," in Gerber (1997) 13–88.
Brown, T.S. (1946) "Euhemerus and the Historians," *HTR* 39: 259–274.
Bücheler, F. (1878, 1879) *Coniectanea* (Bonn); reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1927).
Budelmann, F., ed. (2009) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge).
Bundy, E.L. (1962) *Studia Pindarica I: The Eleventh Olympian Ode* (Berkeley).
Burckhardt, J. (1898–1902) *Griechische Kulturgeschichte* (Berlin; Stuttgart).
Burke, P. (1978) *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (New York).
Burkert, W. (1972) *Homo Necans: Interpretationen altgriechischer Opferriten und Mythen* (Berlin); trans. P. Bing (1983) *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth* (Berkeley).
———. (1977) *Griechische Religion der archaischen und klassischen Epoche* (Berlin); trans. J. Raffan (1985) *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA).
———. (1979) *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual* (Berkeley).
———. (1987) *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge, MA).
Burnett, A.P. (1994) "Hekabe the Dog," *Arethusa* 27: 151–164.
Buttmann, P.K. (1828–1829) *Mythologus: oder, Gesammelte abhandlungen über die sagen des alterhums*. 2 vols. (Berlin).
Cairns, F. (1971) "Five 'Religious' Odes of Horace (I,10; I,21 and IV,6; I,30; I,15)," *AJP* 92: 433–452.
———. (1972) *Generic Composition in Greek and Latin Poetry* (Edinburgh).
———. (1978) "The Genre Palinode and Three Horatian Examples: *Epode* 17; *Odes* 1, 16; *Odes* 1, 34," *AC* 47: 546–552.
———. (2006) *Sextus Propertius: The Augustan Elegist* (Cambridge).
Cameron, A. (1965) "Horace, Epistles ii. 2. 87 ff.," *CR* n.s. 15: 11–13.
Campbell, A.Y. (1924) *Horace: A New Interpretation* (London).
Campbell, S. (1997) *Interpreting the Personal: Expression and the Formation of Feelings* (Ithaca, NY).
Carey, C. (1986) "Archilochus and Lycambes," *CQ* n.s. 36: 60–67.
———. (2009) "Iambos," in Bedelmann (2009) 149–167.
Carrière, J.-C. (1979) *Le carnaval et la politique* (Paris).
Carrubba, R.W. (1965) "A Study of Horace's Eighth and Twelfth Epodes," *Latomus* 24: 591–598.
———. (1966) "The Curse on the Romans," *TAPA* 97: 29–34.
———. (1969) *The Epodes of Horace: A Study in Poetic Arrangement* (The Hague).
———. (2003) "The Structure of Horace's Ship of State: *Odes* 1, 14," *Latomus* 62: 606–615.
Cartledge, P. (1985) "The Greek Religious Festivals," in Easterling and Muir (1985) 98–127.
Cassio, A.C. (1984) "L'accusa di Crizia e le più antiche valutazioni di Archiloco," in *Lirica greca da Archiloco a Elitis: Studi in onore di Filippo Maria Pontani* (Padova) 61–65.
Cávarzere, A. (1994) "*Vate me*: l'ambiguo sigillo dell'epodo XVI," *Aevum Antiquum* 7: 171–190.
———; Aloni, A.; and Barchiesi, A., edd. (2001) *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire* (Lanham, MD).

Chaniotis, A. (1988) *Historie und Historiker in den griechischen Inschriften: epigraphische Beiträge zur griechischen Historiographie* (Stuttgart).
Clarke, J.R. (2007) *Looking At Laughter: Humor, Power, and Transgression in Roman Visual Culture* (Berkeley).
Clay, D. (2004) *Archilochos Heros: The Cult of Poets in the Greek Polis*. Hellenic Studies 6 (Washington D.C.).
Clay, J.S. (1989) "The Hecate of the *Theogony*," *GRBS* 25: 27–38.
Clayman, D.L. (1975) "Horace's Epodes VIII and XII: More than Clever Obscenity?," *CW* 69: 55–61.
———. (1980) *Callimachus' Iambi*. Mnemosyne Supplement 59 (Leiden).
Clinton, K. (1992) *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries. The Martin Nilsson Lectures on Greek Religion, Delivered 19–21 November 1990 at the Swedish Institute at Athens* (Stockholm).
———. (1993) "The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis," in Marinatos and Hägg (1993) *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches* (London) 110–124.
———. (2007) "The Mysteries of Demeter and Kore," in Ogden (2007) 342–356.
Cody, J.V. (1976) *Horace and Callimachean Aesthetics*. Collection Latomus 147 (Brussels).
Cohen, D. (1995) *Law, Violence, and Community in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).
Cole, S.G. (1993) "Procession and Celebration at the Dionysia," in Scodel (1993) 25–38.
Collinge, N.E. (1961) *The Structure of Horace's Odes* (London).
Commager, S. (1962) *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study* (New Haven, CT).
Compton, T.M. (2006) *Victim of the Muses: Poet as Scapegoat, Warrior and Hero in Greco-Roman and Indo-European Myth and History*. Hellenic Studies 11 (Washington D.C.).
Connor, P. (1987) *Horace's Lyric Poetry: The Force of Humour* (Victoria).
Constantakopoulou, C. (2005) "Proud to be an Islander: Island Identity in Multi-Polis Islands in the Classical and Hellenistic Aegean," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 20: 1–34.
Conte, G.B. (1994) *Latin Literature: A History* (Baltimore).
Copley, F.O. (1956) *Exclusus Amator: A Study in Latin Love Poetry* (Madison, WI).
Corbeill, A. (2002) "Ciceronian Invective," in May (2002) 197–218.
Cucchiarelli, A. (2001) *La satira e il poeta. Orazio tra Epodi e Sermones* (Pisa).
D'Arms, J.H. (1967) "Canidia and Campania," *Philologus* 111: 141–145.
Daube, D. (1974) "Withdrawal: Five Verbs," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 7: 93–112.
Davies, M. (1982) "Derivative and Proverbial Testimonia Concerning Stesichorus' Palinode," *QUCC* n.s. 11: 7–16.
Davis, G. (1987) "*Carmina* /*Iambi*: The Literary-Generic Dimension of Horace's *Integer Vitae* (*C.* 1, 22)," *QUCC* n.s. 27: 67–78.
———. (1989) "*Ingenii Cumba*? Literary *aporia* and the rhetoric of Horace's *O navis referent* (C.1.14)," *RhM* n.s. 132: 331–345.
———. (1991) *Polyhymnia: the Rhetoric of Horatian Discourse* (Berkeley).

——, ed. (2010) "Defining a Lyric Ethos: Archilochus *lyricus* and Horatian *melos*," in G. Davis (2010) *A Companion to Horace* (West Sussex) 105–127.
Davis, N.Z. (1975) *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford).
De Vivo, A. (1994) "L'epodo VII di Orazio: il delitto del sangue," *FAM* 5/6: 39–58.
De Witt, N.W. (1935) "Parresiastic Poems of Horace," *CP* 30: 312–319.
Debevoise, N.C. (1938) *A Political History of Parthia* (New York); reprint (New York, 1968: Greenwood Press).
Deroux, C., ed. (1979) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History I*. Collection Latomus 164 (Brussels).
——, ed. (1992) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VI*. Collection Latomus 217 (Brussels).
Derrida, J. (1968) "La pharmacie de Platon," *Tel Quel* 32/33: 3–48, 18–59; collected (1972) in *La dissémination* (Paris); trans. B. Johnson (1981) *Dissemination* (Chicago).
Detienne, M. (1967) *Les maîtres de vérité dans la grèce archaïque* (Paris).
Dickie, M.W. (2001) *Magic and Magicians in the Greco-Roman World* (London).
Dilke, O.A.W. (1958) "When Was the *Ars Poetica* Written?," *BICS* 5: 49–57.
Dobrov, G. (1995) *Beyond Aristophanes: Transition and Diversity in Greek Comedy*. American Classical Studies 38 (Atlanta).
Dominik, W.J.; Garthwaite, J; and Roche, P.A., edd. (2009) *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome* (Leiden).
Dover, K.J. (1964) "The Poetry of Archilochos," in *Archiloque*. Fondation Hardt: Entretiens sur l' antiquité classique 10 (Geneva) 183–222.
——. (1972) *Aristophanic Comedy* (Berkeley).
——. (1974) *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle* (Oxford: Blackwell).
Dowden, K. (1992) *The Uses of Greek Mythology* (New York).
Drexler, H. (1962) "Eine Cicero-Reminiszenz bei Horaz?," *Maia* 14: 40.
——. (1964) "Zur 16. Epode und 4. Ecloge," *Maia* 16: 176–203.
Dunn, F.M. (1989) "Horace's Sacred Spring (*Ode*, I. 1)," *Latomus* 48: 97–109.
Düntzer, H. (1892) "Des Horatius Canidia-gedichte," *Neue Jahrb.* 145: 597–613.
Durkheim, E. (1912) *Les Formes élémentairee de la vie religieuse: Le Système totémique en Australie* (Paris); trans. J.W. Swain (1917) *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life: A Study in Religious Sociology* (London).
Dyson, M. (1968) "Horace, Odes I 16," *AUMLA* 30: 169–179.
Easterling, P.E. (1985) "Greek Poetry and Greek Religion," in Easterling and Muir (1985) 34–49.
——, and Muir, J.V., edd. (1985) *Greek Religion and Society* (Cambridge).
Edmunds, L., ed. (1990) *Approaches to Greek Myth* (Baltimore).
Edwards, A.T. (1993) "Historicizing the Popular Grotesque: Bakhtin's Rabelais and Old Attic Comedy," in Scodel (1993) 89–117.
Eidinow, J.S.C. (2010) "Horace: Critics, Canons, and Canonicity," in Houghton and Wyke (2010) 80–95.
Emerson, C., ed. (1999) *Critical Essays on Mikhail Bakhtin* (New York).
——. (2002) "Coming to Terms with Bakhtin's Carnival: Ancient, Modern, *sub Specie Aeternitatis*," in Branham (2002) 5–26.

Esler, C.C. (1989) "Horace's Old Girls: Evolution of a Topos," in Falkner and de Luce (1989) 172–182.
Falkner. T. (1955) *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy* (Norman, OK).
Falkner, T., and de Luce, J., edd. (1989) *Old Age in Greek and Latin Literature* (Albany, NY).
Favro, D. (1996) *The Urban Image of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge).
Fedeli, P. (1978) "Il v Epodo e i giambi d'Orazio come espressione d'arte alessandrina," *MPhL* 3: 67–138.
Feeney, D.C. (1993) "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets," in Rudd (1993) 41–63.
———. (2002) "*Una Cum Scriptore Meo*. Poetry, Principate and the Traditions of Literary History in the Epistle to Augustus," in Woodman and Feeney (2002) 172–187.
———. (2009) "Becoming an Authority: Horace On His Own Reception," in Houghton and Wyke (Cambridge) 16–38.
Ferguson, J. (1975) *Utopias of the Classical World* (Ithaca, NY).
Fiore, B. (2004) "The Pastoral Epistles in the Light of Philodemus' 'On Frank Criticism,'" in Fitzgerald (2004) 271–294.
Fish, J. (2004) "Anger, Philodemus' Good King, and the Helen Episode of the Aeneid," in Armstrong (2004) 111–138.
Fiske, G.C. (1920) *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (Madison, WI).
Fitzgerald, J.T., ed. (1996) *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World* (Leiden).
———; Obbink, D.; and Holland, G.S., edd. (2004) *Philodemus and the New Testament World* (Leiden).
Fitzgerald, W. (1988) "Power and Impotence in Horace's Epodes," *Ramus* 17: 176–191.
Fontenrose, J. (1966) *The Ritual Theory of Myth*. Folklore Studies 18 (Berkeley).
Forsdyke, S. (2005) "Revelry and Riot in Archaic Megara: Democratic Disorder or Ritual Reversal?," *JHS* 125: 73–92.
Foucault, M. (1966) "La Pensée du dehors," *Critique* 229; trans. B. Massumi (1983) *Maurice Blanchard, The Thought from the Outside* (New York).
———. (1977) *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*; trans. D.F. Bouchard and S. Simon (Ithaca, NY).
———. (2001) *L'herméneutique du sujet: cours au Collège de France* (Paris); trans. G. Burchell (2004) *The Hermeneutics of the Subject: lecture at the Collège de France, 1981–1982* (New York).
Fowler, D. (1993) "Images of Horace in Twentieth-Century Scholarship," in Martindale and Hopkins (1993) 268–276.
———. (1994) "Postmodernism, Romantic Irony and Classical Closure," in I. de Jong and J.P. Sullivan (1994) 231–256.
Fraenkel, E. (1957) *Horace* (Oxford).
Frank, T. (1936) "On Horace's Controversies with the New Poets," in *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps on his Seventieth Birthday* (Princeton) 159–167.

Frazer, J.G. (1913) *The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion* [Part VI], *The Scapegoat*; 3rd ed. (London).
Freis, R. (2005) "*Amor* and *Pietas*: The Catullan Revolution and the Horatian Counter-Revolution," in Batstone and Tissol (2005) 61–77.
French, V. (1986) "Midwives and Maternity Care in the Roman World," *Helios* n.s. 13: 69–84.
Freudenburg, K. (2001) *Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal* (Cambridge).
———, ed. (2005) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Satire* (Cambridge).
Frischer, B. (1991) *Shifting Paradigms: New Approaches to Horace's* Ars Poetica (Atlanta, GA).
Fuchs, H. (1938) *Der Geistige Widerstand gegen Rome in der antiken Welt* (Berlin).
———. (1954) "Zu einigen Aussagen des Horaz," in Meier (1954) 39–53.
Gabba, E. (1981) "True History and False History," *JRS* 71: 50–60.
Gagnè, R. (2009) "A Wolf at the Table: Sympotic Perjury in Archilochus," *TAPA* 139: 251–274.
Garnsey, E. (1907) *Epilegomena on Horace, in the form of a critical letter* (London).
Geffcken, K. (1973) *Comedy in the* Pro Caelio (Leiden).
Gentili, B. (1988) *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece: from Homer to the Fifth Century*; trans. A. Thomas Cole (Baltimore).
Gerber, D.E. (1991) "Early Greek Elegy and Iambus 1921–1989," *Lustrum* 33: 7–225; 401–409.
———, ed. (1997) *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden).
Gernet, L. (1968) *Anthropologie de la Grèce antique* (Paris); trans. J. Hamilton and B. Nagy (1981) *Anthropology of Ancient Greece* (Baltimore).
Ghiselli, A. (1974) *Orazio, Ode 1,1. Saggio di analisi formale*; 3rd ed. (Bologna, 2001).
Giangrande, G. (1967) "Two Horatian Problems," *CQ* n.s. 17: 327–331.
Girard, R. (1972) *La violence et le sacré* (Paris); trans. P. Gregory (1977) *Violence and the Sacred* (Baltimore).
———. (1982) *Le Bouc émissaire* (Paris); trans. Y. Freccero (1986) *Scapegoat* (Baltimore).
Glad, C.E. (1995) *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy* (Leiden).
Gold, B. (1992) "Openings in Horace's *Satires* and *Odes*: Poet, Patron, and Audience," *YCS* 29: 161–185.
Gould, J. (1985) "On Making Sense of Greek Religion," in Easterling and Muir (1985) 1–33.
Gowers, E. (1993) *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature* (Oxford).
Gowing, A.M. (1992) *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio* (Ann Arbor).
Graf, F. (1974) *Eleusis und die orphische Dichtung Athens in vorhellenistischer Zeit* (Berlin).

———. (1985) *Griechische Mythologie: eine Einführung* (Munich); trans. T. Marier (1993) *Greek Mythology: An Introduction* (Baltimore).
———, ed. (1998) *Ansichten griechischer Rituale: Geburtstags-Symposium für Walter Burkert* (Stuttgart).
———. (2005) "Satire in a Ritual Context," in Freudenburg (2005) 192–206.
Grassmann, V. (1966) *Die erotischen Epoden des Horaz: Literature Hintergrund und sprachliche Tradition* (Munich).
Graver, M. (1995) "Dog-Helen and Homeric Insult," *ClAnt* 14: 41–61.
Gregg, J. (1994) *Maurice Blanchot and the Literature of Transgression* (Princeton).
Griffiths, A. (2002) "The *Odes*: Just where do you draw the line?," in Woodman and Feeney (2002) 65–79.
Griffiths, P.E. (1997) *What Emotions Really Are: The Problem of Psychological Categories* (Chicago).
Gutting, G., ed. (1994) *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault* (Cambridge).
Gutzwiller, K. (1998) *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley).
Hadot, P. (1995) *Qu'est-ce que le philosophie antique?* (Paris); trans. M. Chase (2002) *What is Philosophy?* (Cambridge, MA).
Haendel, P. von, and Meid, W., edd. (1983) *Festschrift für Robert Muth zum 65. Geburtstag am Januar 1 1981 dargebracht von Freuden und Kollegen* (Innsbruck).
Hahn, E.A. (1939) "Epodes 5 and 17, Carmina 1.16 and 1.17," *TAPA* 70: 213–230.
Halliwell, S. (1986) *Aristotle's Poetics* (Chapel Hill, NC).
———. (1991) "The Uses of Laughter in Greek Culture," *CQ* n.s.41: 279–296.
———. (2002) *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems* (Princeton).
———. (2004) "Aischrology, Shame, and Comedy," in Sluiter and Rosen (2004) 115–144.
———. (2008) *Greek Laughter: A Study in Cultural Psychology From Homer to Early Christianity* (Cambridge).
Hardin, R.F. (1983) " 'Ritual' in Recent Criticism: The Elusive Sense of Community," *PMLA* 98: 846–862.
Hardison, O.B., Jr., and Golden, L. (1995) *Horace for Students of Literature: The "Ars Poetica" and Its Tradition* (Gainesville, FL).
Harley, D. (1990) "Historians as Demonologists: The Myth of the Midwife-witch," *Social History of Medicine* 3: 1–26.
Harriott, R.M. (1982) "The Argive Elders, the Discerning Shepherd and the Fawning Dog: Misleading Communication in the *Agamemnon*," *CQ* n.s. 32: 9–17.
Harris, W.V. (2001) *Restraining Rage: The Ideology of Anger Control in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA).
Harrison, G. (1987) "The Confessions of Lucilius (Horace *Sat.* 2.1.30–34): A Defense of Autobiographical Satire?," *CA* 6: 38–52.
Harrison, J.E. (1903) *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* (Cambridge).

Harrison, S.J. (1989) "Two Notes on Horace, Epodes (10, 16)," *CQ* n.s. 39: 271–274.
———, ed. (1995) *Homage to Horace* (Oxford).
———. (2001) "Some Generic Problems in Horace's *Epodes*: Or, On (Not) Being Archilochus," in Cávarzere, Aloni, and Barchiesi (2001) 165–186.
———. (2001b) "Fatal Attraction: Paris, Helen, and the Unity of Catullus 51," *CB* 77: 161–167.
———, ed. (2007) *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (Cambridge).
———. (2007b) *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* (Oxford).
Harrison, T. (2007) "Greek Religion and Literature," in Ogden (2007) 373–384.
Hawkins, T. (2008) "Out-Foxing the Wolf-Walker: Lykambes as Performative Rival to Archilochus," *CA* 27: 93–114.
Heath. M. (1989) "The Unity of Plato's *Phaedrus*," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 7: 151–173.
———. (1989) "The Unity of Plato's *Phaedrus*: A Postscript," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 7: 189–191.
Hedrick, C.W., Jr. (2007) "Religion and Society in Classical Greece," in Ogden (2007) 283–296.
Heinze, R. (1923) "Die Horazische Ode," in Heinze (1960) 172–189.
———. (1960) *Vom Geist des Römertums. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, 3rd ed. (Darmstadt).
Hembold, W.C., and Holther, W.B. (1952) "The Unity of the *Phaedrus*," *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 14: 387–417.
Henderson, Jeffrey (1975) *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy* (New Haven, CT); 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1991).
———. (1976) "The Cologne Epode and the Conventions of Early Greek Erotic Poetry," *Arethusa* 9: 159–179.
Henderson, John. (1987) "Suck It and See (Horace, Epode 8)" in Whitby, Hardie, and Whitby (1987) 105–118; reprinted in Henderson, *Writing Down Rome: Satire, Comedy, and other Offences in Latin Poetry* (Oxford, 1999) 93–113.
———. (1998) *Fighting For Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War* (Cambridge).
———. (1999) "Horace Talks Rough and Dirty: No Comment (Epodes 8 & 12)," *Scholia* n.s. 8: 3–16.
Hermann, G. (1842) *De primo carmine Horatii* (Leipzig); reprinted in *Opuscula*. 8 vols. (1827–1877).
Heyworth, S. (1993) "Horace's Ibis: On the Titles, Unity, and Contents of the Epodes," *PLLS* 7: 85–96.
Hickson-Hahn, F.V. (1998) "What's So Funny?: Laughter and Incest in Invective Humor," *SyllClass* 9: 1–36.
Hills, P.D. (2001) "Ennius, Suetonius, and the Genesis of Horace, *Odes* 4," *CQ* n.s. 51: 613–616.
———. (2005) *Horace* (London).
Holzberg, N. (2002) *Martial und das antike Epigramm* (Darmstadt).
Hooke, S.H., ed. (1933) *Myth and Rituals: Essays and the Myth and Rituals of the Hebrews in Relation to the Cultural Pattern of the Ancient East* (London).
Hooley, D.M. (2007) *Roman Satire* (Malden, MA).

Hornblower, S. (2009) "Greek Lyric and the Politics and Sociologies of Archaic and Classical Greek Communities," in Budelmann (2009) 39–57.
Horsfall, N. (1973) "Three Notes on Horace's Epodes," *Philologus* 117: 136–138.
Houghton, L.B.T. (2004) "The Wolf and the Dog (Horace, *Sermones* 2.2.64)," *CQ* n.s. 54: 300–304.
———, and Wyke, M., edd. (2010) *Perceptions of Horace: A Roman Poet and His Readers* (Cambridge).
Housman, A.E. (1882) "Horatiana," *JP* 10: 187–196.
———. (1889) "Horatiana," *JP* 18: 1–35.
———. (1902) "Ovid ART. AM. I 337," *CR* 16: 442–446.
———. (1923) "Horace, *Epode* XIII 3," *CR* 37: 104.
Hubbard, T.K. (1991) *The Mask of Comedy: Aristophanes and the Intertextual Parabasis* (Ithaca, NY).
———. (2000) "Horace and Catullus: The Case of the Suppressed Precursor in *Odes* 1.22 and 1.32," *CW* 94: 25–37.
Hughes, D. (1991) *Human Sacrifice in Ancient Greece* (London).
Hughes, J.J. (1998) "Invective and Comedic Allusion: Cicero, *In Pisonem*, fragment 9 (Nisbet)," *Latomus* 57: 570–577.
Hutchinson, G. (2007) "Horace and Archaic Greek Poetry," in Harrison (2007) 36–49.
Indelli, G. (2004) "The Vocabulary of Anger in Philodemus' *De ira* and Vergil's *Aeneid*," in Armstrong (2004) 103–110.
Ingallina, S. (1974) *Orazio e la magia: Sat. I 8; Epodi 5 e 17* (Palermo).
Jäger, F. (1913) "Das antike Propemptikon und das 17. Gedicht des Paulinus von Nola" (Diss., Munich).
James, S. (2003) *Learned Girls and Male Persuasion: Gender and Reading in Roman Love Elegy* (Berkeley).
Janko, R. (1984) *Aristotle on Comedy: Towards A Reconstruction of Poetics II* (Berkeley).
Jenkyns, R. (1982) "*O matre pulchra*," *Latomus* 41: 146–151.
———. (1982b) *Three Classical Poets: Sappho, Catullus, and Juvenal* (London).
Jocelyn, H.D. (1982) "Boats, Women, and Horace Odes 1.14," *CP*: 77: 330–335.
Johnson, T.S. (1997) "Sympotica Horatiana: Problems of Artistic Integrity," *Philologus* 141: 321–337.
———. (2004) "Locking-in and Locking-out Lydia: Lyric Form and Power in Horace's *C.* I.25 and III.9," *CJ* 99: 113–134.
———. (2004b) *A Symposion of Praise: Horace Returns to Lyric in Odes IV* (Madison, WI).
———. (2009) "Lyric, History, and Imagination: Horace as Historiographer (*C.* 2.1)," *CJ* 104: 311–320.
Johnson, W.R. (1982) *The Idea of Lyric: Lyric Modes in Ancient and Modern Poetry* (Berkeley).
Johnston, S.I. (1995) "Defining the Dreadful: Remarks on the Greek Child-Killing Demon," in Meyer and Mirecki (1995) 361–387.
de Jong, I., and Sullivan, J.P., edd. (1994) *Modern Critical Theory and Classical Literature* (Leiden).

Julhe, J.-C. (2004) *La critique littéraire chez Catulle et les Élégiaques augustéens* (Louvain).
Kaster, R.A. (2005) *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome* (Oxford).
Kerényi, K. (1941) "Korê," in C.G. Jung and K. Kerényi, *Einführung in das Wesen der Mythologie: Gottkindmythos eleusinische Mysterien* (Amsterdam); trans. R.F.C. Hull (1963) *Essays on the Science of Mythology: The Myths of the Divine Child and the Divine Maiden* (New York) 101–155.
Kerkhecker, A. (1999) *Callimachus' Book of Iambi* (Oxford).
Keyser, P. (1989) "Horace *Odes* 1.13.3–8, 14–16. Humoural and Aetherial Love," *Philologus* 133: 75–81.
Khan, H.A. (1967) "Horace's Ode to Virgil on the Death of Quintilius: 1, 24," *Latomus* 26: 107–117.
Kienast, D. (1969) "Augustus und Alexander," *Gymnasium* 76: 430–456.
Kilpatrick, R. (1970) "An Interpretation of Horace, Epodes 13," *CQ* n.s. 20: 135–141.
———. (1990) *The Poetry of Criticism: Horace,* Epistles II *and* Ars Poetica (Edmonton, Alberta).
———. (1996) "*Amicus Medicus*: Medicine and Epicurean Therapy in *De Rerum Natura*," *MAAR* 41: 69–100.
Kirk, G.S. (1970) *Myth. Its Meaning and Function in Ancient and Other Cultures* (Cambridge).
Kirkwood, G.M. (1961) "The Authorship of the Strasbourg Epodes," *TAPA* 92: 267–282.
Kirn, B. (1935) *Zur literarischen Stellung von Horazens Jambenbuch* (Diss., Tübingen).
Konstan, D. (2003) "Aristotle on Anger and the Emotions: The Strategies of Status," *YCS* 32: 99–120.
———. (2006) *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (Toronto).
Körte, A. (1890) "Augusteer bei Philodem," *RhM* 45: 172–177.
Kraggerud, E. (1984) *Horaz und Actium: Studien zu den politischen Epoden. SO* suppl. 26 (Oslo).
———. (2000) "Critica (II): Potent Drugs? The Text of Horace *Epod.* 5.87f.," *SO* 75: 80–88.
Krämer, H.J. (1965) "Die Sage von Romulus und Remus in der Lateinischen Literatur," in *Synusia: Festgabe für W. Schadewaldt* (Pfullingen) 355–402.
Kroll, W. (1924) *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* (Stuttgart).
Kukula, R.C. (1911) *Römische Säkularpoesie, neue Studien zu Horaz' XVI. Epodus und Vergils IV. Ekloge* (Leipzig).
La Penna, A. (1969) *Le opere. [Di] Q. Orazio Flacco. Antologia* (Florence).
Lardinois, A., and McClure, L. edd. (2001) *Making Silence Speak: Women's Voices in Greek Literature and Society* (Princeton).
Lazare, A. (2004) *On Apology* (Oxford).
Le Roy Ladurie, Emmanuel (1966) *Les paysans de Languedoc* (Paris); trans. J. Day (1974) *The Peasants of Languedoc* (Urbana, IL).

Leach, E.W. (1978) "Vergil, Horace, Tibullus. Three Collections of Ten," *Ramus* 7: 79–105.
Leeman, A.D. (1982) "Rhetorical Status in Horace, *Serm*. 2, 1," in Vickers (1982) 159–163.
———. (1983) "Die Konsultierung des Trabatius. Statuslehre in Horaz, Serm 2,1," in von Haendel and Meid (1983) 209–215.
Lefèvre, E. (1993) *Horaz: Dichter im augusteischen Rom* (Munich).
Lenz, L. (1994) "Zwei Flaneure: Anakreon 54 D. (= 388 PMG) und Horaz' 4. Epode," *Gymnasium* 101: 483–501.
Levi, P. (1997) *Horace: A Life* (London).
Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G. (1979) *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford).
Lilja, S. (1976) *Dogs in Ancient Greek Poetry* (Helsinki).
Lindo, L.I. (1969) "Horace's Seventeenth Epode," *CP* 64: 176–177.
Lorenz, K. (1963) *Das sogenannte Böse: Zur Naturgeschichte der Aggression* (Wien).
Loupiac, A. (1997) "La trilogie d'Actium et l'épode IX d'Horace: document historique ou *carmen symposiacum*," *REL* 75: 129–140.
———. (1998) "La trilogie d'Actium et l'épode IX d'Horace: document historique ou *carmen symposiacum*," *BAGB* 3: 250–259.
Lowrie, M. (1992) "A Sympotic Achilles: Horace, *Epodes* 13," *AJP* 113: 413–433.
———. (1995) "A Parade of Lyric Predecessors: Horace *C*. 1.12–1.18," *Phoenix* 49: 33–48.
———. (1997) *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford).
———, ed. (2009) *Horace: Odes and Epodes* (Oxford).
———. (2009b) *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome* (Oxford).
Luck, G. (1959) *The Latin Love Elegy* (New York); 2nd ed. (London, 1969).
———. (1976) "An Interpretation of Horace's Eleventh Epode," *ICS* 1: 122–126.
Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1980) *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace* (Oxford).
———. (1995) *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry* (New Haven).
MacKay, L.A. (1962) "*Odes* I, 16 and 17: *O Matre Pulchra* …, *Velox Amoenum* …," *AJP* 83: 298–300.
MacLeod, C.W. (1979) "Horace and the Sibyl (Epode 16.2)," *CQ* n.s. 29: 220–221.
Mankin, D. (1989) "Achilles in Horace's 13th Epode," *WS* 102: 133–140.
Manning, C.E. (1970) "Canidia in the *Epodes* of Horace," *Mnemosyne* 23: 393–401.
Maranhão, T. (1986) *Therapeutic Discourse and Socratic Dialogue: A Cultural Critique* (Madison, WI).
Marcovich, M. (1975) "A New Poem of Archilochus: *P. Colon*. inv. 7511," *GRBS* 16: 5–14.
Marinatos, N., and Hägg, R., edd. (1993) *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches* (London).
Mariotti, S. (1963) "Intorno a Domizio Marso," in Rostagni (1963) 588–614.
Martin, R. (2001) "Just Like a Woman: Enigmas of the Lyric Voice," in Lardinois and McClure (2001) 55–74.

Martindale, C., and Hopkins, D., edd. (1993) *Horace Made New: Horatian influences on British writing from the Renaissance to the twentieth century* (Cambridge).
Maurach, G. (2001) *Horaz: Werk und Leben* (Heidelberg).
May, J.M., ed. (2002) *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric* (Leiden).
McDonough, C.M. (1997) "Carna, Proca and the Strix on the Kalends of June," *TAPA*: 127: 315–344.
McHardy, F. (2008) *Revenge in Athenian Culture* (London).
McKeown, J.C. (2010) *A Cabinet of Roman Curiosities: Strange Tales and Surprising Facts from the World's Greatest Empire* (Oxford).
McMahon, J.M. (1998) Paralysin Cave: *Impotence, Perception, and Text in the* Satyrica *of Petronius* (Leiden).
McNeill, R.L.B. (2001) *Horace: Image, Identity, and Audience* (Baltimore).
Meier, F., ed. *Westöstliche Abhandlungen R. Tschudi zum 70. Geburstag* (Wiesbaden).
Mendell, C.W. (1938) "Horace I. 14," *CP* 33: 145–156.
Merrill, N.W. (1975) "Cicero and Early Roman Invective" (Diss., University of Cincinnati).
Meyer, M., and Mirecki, P., edd. *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (Leiden).
Miller, P.A. (1994) *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome* (London).
———. (1998) "The Bodily Grotesque in Roman Satire: Images of Sterility," *Arethusa* 31: 257–283.
———. (2004) *Subjecting Verses: Latin Love Elegy and the Emergence of the Real* (Princeton).
Miralles, C., and Pòrtulas, J. (1983) *Archilochus and the Iambic Poetry*. Filologia e critica, 45 (Rome).
Möllendorf, P. von (1995) *Grundlagen einer Ästhetik der Alten Komödie: Untersuchungen zu Aristophanes und Michail Bachtin*. Classica Monacensia 9 (Tübingen).
Morrison, A.P. (1996) *The Culture of Shame* (New York).
Muecke, F. (1995), "Law, Rhetoric, and Genre in Horace, *Satires* 2.1," in Harrison (1995) 203–218.
Muir, J.V. (1981) "Two Poems of Horace," *Latomus* 40: 322–331.
Muretus, M.A. (1559) *Variarum lectionum libri VIII* (Venice).
Murgatroyd, P. (1982) "The Tease in Horace, Odes 1.16," *CQ* n.s. 32: 238–239.
Murphy, J.G., and Hampton, J. (1988) *Forgiveness and Mercy* (Cambridge).
Musurillo, H. (1962) "The Poet's Apotheosis: Horace Odes 1.1," *TAPA* 93: 230–239.
Mylonas, G.E. (1961) *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries* (Princeton).
Nagy, G. (1976) "*Iambos*: Typologies of Invective and Praise," *Arethusa* 9: 191–205.
———. (1979) *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore); rev. ed. (1999).
Nancy, Jean-Luc (2002) *À l'écoute* (Paris); trans. C. Mandell (2007) *Listening* (New York).
Nauta, R.R. (1987) "Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis* as Saturnalian Literature," *Mnemosyne* 40: 69–96.

Newman, J.K. (1967) *Augustus and the New Poetry*. Collection Latomus 88 (Brussels).
———. (1967b) *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*. Collection Latomus 89 (Brussels).
———. (1990) *Roman Catullus and the Modification of the Alexandrian Sensibility* (Hildesheim).
———. (1998) "Iambe/Iambos and the Rape of a Genre: A Horatian sidelight," *ICS* 23: 101–120.
Nilsson, M.P. (1940) *Greek Popular Religion* (New York).
———. (1951) *Cults, Myths, Oracles, and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund).
Nisbet, R.G.M. (1984) "Horace's *Epodes* in History," in Woodman and West (1984) 1–18, 197–200.
———. (2007) "Horace: Life and Chronology," in Harrison (2007) 7–21.
O'Higgins, D.M. (2001) "Women's Cultic Joking and Mockery: Some Perspectives," in Lardinois and McClure (2001) 137–160.
———. (2003) *Women and Humor in Classical Greece* (Cambridge).
Obbink, D. (1995) *Philodemus and Poetry: Poetic Theory and Practice in Lucretius, Philodemus, and Horace* (Oxford).
Ogden, D. (1997) *The Crooked Kings of Ancient Greece* (London).
———, ed. (2007) *A Companion to Greek Religion* (Malden, MA).
Olender, M. (1985) "Aspects de Baubô," *RHR* 202: 3–55; trans. R. Lamberton in Halperin, Winkler, and Zeitlin, edd. (1989) *Before Sexuality: The Construction of the Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World* (Princeton) 83–113.
Oliensis, E. (1991) "Canidia, Canicula, and the Decorum of Horace's *Epodes*," *Arethusa* 24: 107–138.
———. (1998) *Horace and the Rhetoric of Authority* (Cambridge).
Osborne, R. (1990) "Competitive Festivals and the Polis: A Context for Dramatic Festivals at Athens," in Sommerstein (1990) 21–38.
Osgood, J. (2006) *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire* (Cambridge).
Palmer, A. (1891) "Horatiana," *CR* 5: 139–142.
Parker, R. (1983) *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford).
———. (1996) *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford).
———. (1997) "Gods Cruel and Kind: Tragic and Civic Ideology," in Pelling (1997) 213–235.
Paschalis, M., ed. (2002) *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry* (Rethymnon).
Pasoli, E. (1971) "Per una rilettura del proemio di Orazio lirico," in *Studi filologici e storici in onore di Vittorio de Falco* (Naples) 409–433.
Pasquali, G. (1920) *Orazio lirico* (Florence); reprint (1966).
Pelling, C., ed. (1997) *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford).
Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. (1927) *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy* (Oxford).
Plass, P. (1968) "The Unity of the *Phaedrus*," *SO* 43: 7–38.
Plüss, T. (1897) "Die sechzehnte *Epode* des Horatius," *Neue Jahrb.* 155: 73–80.
———. (1904) *Das Jambenbuch des Horaz* (Leipzig).
Pomeroy, A.J. (1980) "A Man at a Spring: Horace, Odes 1.1," *Ramus* 9: 34–50.

Porter, D. (1987) *Horace's Poetic Journey: A Reading of Odes 1–3* (Princeton).
———. (1995) "*Quo Quo Scelesti Ruitis*: The Downward Momentum of Horace's *Epodes*," *ICS* 20: 107–130.
Powell, A., and Welch, K., edd. (2002) *Sextus Pompeius* (Swansea).
———. (2008) *Virgil The Partisan: A Study in the Re-integration of Classics* (Swansea).
Premerstein, A. von (1937) *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats*. Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Abteilung. Heft 15 (Munich).
Putnam, M.C.J. (1973) "Horace *C.* 3.30: The Lyricist as Hero," *Ramus* 2: 1–19.
———. (1993) "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24," *CJ* 88: 123–135.
———. (1998) *Virgil's Epic Designs: Ekphrasis in the* Aeneid (New Haven, CT).
———. (2006) *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace* (Princeton).
Quinn, K. (1963) *Latin Explorations: Critical Studies in Roman Literature* (London).
Race, W.H. (1978) "*Odes* 1.20: An Horatian *Recusatio*," *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 11: 179–196.
———. (1982) *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius* (Leiden).
———. (1988) *Classical Genres and English Poetry* (London).
Rankin, H.D. (1975) "ΜΟΙΧΟΣ, ΛΑΓΝΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΥΒΡΙΣΤΗΣ: Critias and His Judgement of Archilochus," *GB* 3: 324–334.
Rebuffat, R. (1976) "Arva beata petamus arva divites et insulas," in *L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine: Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon*. 2 vol. *Collection de l'École française de Rome* 27 (Rome) 877–902.
Reckford, K. (1969) *Horace* (New York).
———. (1987) *Aristophanes' Old-and-New Comedy* [v. 1]: *Six Essays in Perspective* (Chapel Hill, NC).
Redfield, J. (1975) *Nature and Culture in the* Iliad: *The Tragedy of Hector* (Chicago).
Reeder, J.C. (1992) "Typology and Ideology in the Mausoleum of Augustus: *tumulus* and *tholos*," *CLAnt* 11: 265–307.
Reitzenstein, R. (1899) "Zwei neue Fragmente der Epoden des Archilochos," *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 45: 857–864.
———. (1925) *Das Römische in Cicero und Horaz*. Neue Wege zur Antike 2 (Leipzig).
Richlin, A. (1983) *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor* (New Haven, CT); rev. ed. (New York, 1992).
———. (1984) "Invective Against Women in Roman Satire," *Arethusa* 17: 67–80.
Riechel, D.C., ed. (1978) *Wege der Worte: Festschrift für Wolfgang Fleischhauer* (Cologne).
Robertson, M. (1985) "Greek Art and Religion," in Easterling and Muir (1985) 155–190.
Rooy, C.A. van. (1973) " 'Imitatio' of Vergil, *Eclogues* in Horace, *Satires*, Book I," *AClass* 16: 69–88.
Rosaldo, M.Z. (1984) "Toward an Anthropology of Self and Feeling," in Shweder and LeVine (1984) 137–157.

Rose, G.P. (1979) "Odysseus' Barking Heart," *TAPA* 109: 215–230.
Rosen, R.M. (1988) *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*. American Classical Studies 19 (Atlanta).
———. (1995) "Plato Comicus and the Evolution of Greek Comedy," in Dobrov (1995) 119–138.
———. (2007) *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire* (Oxford).
———, and Baines, V. (2002) " 'I Am Whatever You Say I Am …': Satiric Program in Juvenal and Eminem," *Classical and Modern Literature* 22.2: 103–127.
———, and Marks, D.R. (1999) "Comedies of Transgression in Gangsta Rap and Ancient Classical Poetry," *New Literary History* 30: 897–928.
Rösler, W. (1986) "Michail Bachtin und die Karnivalskultur im antiken Griechenland," *QUCC* n.s. 23: 25–44.
Rostagni, A. (1963) *Miscellanea di studi alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni* (Turin).
Roth, P. (2000) *The Human Stain* (New York).
Rotstein, A. (2007) "Critias' Invective Against Archilochus," *CP* 102: 139–154.
———. (2010) *The Idea of Iambos* (Oxford).
Rowe, C.J. (1989) "The Unity of the *Phaedrus*: A Reply to Heath," *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 7: 175–188.
———, and Schofield, M., edd. (2000) *Greek and Roman Political Thought* (Cambridge).
Rudd, N., ed. (1993) *Horace 2000: A Celebration, Essays for the Bimillennium* (Ann Arbor).
Sampley, J.P. (2004) "Paul's Frank Speech with the Galatians and Corinthians," in Fitzgerald (2004) 295–322.
Santirocco, M.S. (1986) *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes* (Chapel Hill, NC).
Schmid, U. (1964) *Die Priamel der Werte im Griechischen von Homer bis Paulus* (Wiesbaden).
Schmidt, E.A. (1977) "Amica vis pastoribus: Der Jambiker Horaz in seinem Epodenbuch," *Gymnasium* 84: 401–423.
———. (1990) "Das Epodenbuch des Horaz," in *Notwehrdichtung: Moderne Jambik von Chénier bis Borchardt: mit einer Skizze zur antiken Jambik* (Munich) 131–170.
Schneider, C.D. (1977) *Shame, Exposure, and Privacy* (Boston).
Schönberger, O. (1966) "*Horatius, carm.* I, 1," *Gymnasium* 73: 388–412.
Scodel, R. (1987) "Horace, Lucilius, and Callimachean Polemic," *HSCP* 91: 199–215.
———, ed. (1993) *Theater and Society in the Classical World* (Ann Arbor).
Screech, M.A. (1997) *Laughter at the Foot of the Cross* (London).
Scullion, S. (2007) "Festivals," in Ogden (2007) 190–203.
Seaford, R. (1994) *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Cambridge).
Searle, J.R. (1969) *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge).
———. (1975) "Indirect Speech Acts," in P. Cole and J.L. Morgan, edd. (1975) *Speech Acts*. Syntax and Semantics 3 (New York) 59–82.

Seel, O. (1970) "Zur Ode I,14 des Horaz, Zweifel an einer communis opinio," in Ableitinger and Gugel (1970) 204–249.
Segal, C. (1973) "*Felices ter et amplius*: Horace, *Odes*, 1.13," *Latomus* 32: 39–46.
Segal, E. (1968) *Roman Laughter: The Comedy of Plautus* (Cambridge, MA).
Seidel, M. (1979) *Satiric Inheritance: Rabelais to Sterne* (Princeton).
Sellar, A.Y. (1892) *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age: Horace and the Elegiac Poets* (Oxford).
Senay, P. (1982) "Les épodes XVI et VII. Premiers manifestes politiques d' Horace," in *Mélanges offerts en hommage au révérend père Étienne Gareau* (Ottawa) 153–157.
Setaioli, A. (1973) "Il proemio dei Carmina Oraziani," *Atti e Mem. dell'Accad. Toscana di Sc. e Lett. La Colombaria* 38: 1–59
——. (1981) "Gli Epodi di Orazio nella critica dal 1937 al 1972 (con un appendice fino al 1978)," *ANRW* II 31.3.1674–1788.
Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (1982) *Profile of Horace* (Cambridge, MA).
Shey, J.H. (1971) "The Poet's Progress, *Ode* 1.1," *Arethusa* 4.2: 185–196.
Shweder, R.A., and LeVine, R.A., edd. (1984) *Culture Theory: Essays on Mind, Self, and Emotion* (Cambridge).
Sider, D. (1989) "The Blinding of Stesichorus," *Hermes* 117: 423–431.
Slings, S.R., ed. (1990) *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric* (Amsterdam).
Sluiter, I., and Rosen, R., edd. (2004) *Free Speech in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden).
Smith, B. (1990) "Towards a History of Speech Act Theory," in A. Burkhardt, ed. (1990) *Speech Acts, Meaning, and Intentions: Critical Approaches to the Philosophy of John R. Searle* (Berlin) 29–61.
Smith, R.A. (2005) *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil's* Aeneid (Austin, TX).
Smolenaars, J.L.L. (1987) "Labour in the Golden Age: A Unifying Theme in Vergil's Poems," *Mnemosyne* 40: 391–405.
Snell, B. (1938) "Die 16. Epode von Horaz und Vergils 4. Ekloge," *Hermes* 73: 237–242.
Solomon, R.C. (1984) "Getting Angry: The Jamesian Theory of Emotion in Anthropology," in Shweder and LeVine (1984) 238–254.
Sommerstein, A.H., et al., ed. *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis: Papers from the Greek Drama Conference, Nottingham, 18–20 July 1990* (Bari).
Spisak, A.L. (2007) *Martial: A Social Guide* (London).
Steiner, D. (2001) "Slander's Bite: Nemean 7.102–5 and the Language of Invective," *JHS* 121: 154–158.
Storr, A. (1968) *Human Aggression* (New York).
Sturtevant, E.H. (1912) "*O Matre Pulchra Filia Pulchrior*," *CR* 26: 119–122.
Suder, W. (1992) "Old Age and Eros in the Early Roman Empire: Some Opinions," in Deroux (1992) 228–236.
Sussman, L.A. (1998) "Antony the *meretrix audax*: Cicero's Novel Invective in *Philippic* 2.44–46," *Eranos* 96: 114–128.
Sutherland, E.H. (2002) *Horace's Well-Trained Reader: Toward a Methodology of Audience Participation in the* Odes (Frankfurt am Main).
Syme, R. (1939) *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford).
Syndikus, H.P. (1995) "Some Structures in Horace's *Odes*," in Harrison (1995) 17–31.

Tandoi, V. (1976) "L'arguzia del carme 54 di C.," *SIFC* 48: 5–28.
Tarrant, R.J. (1995) "*Da Capo* Structure in Some *Odes* of Horace," in Harrison (1995) 32–49.
Taylor, G. (1985) *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment* (Oxford).
Taylor, L.R. (1931) *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, CT).
Thalmann, W.G. (1988) "Thersites: Comedy, Scapegoats, and Heroic Ideology in the *Iliad*," *TAPA* 118: 1–28.
Thom, S. (2000) "The Individual and Society: An Organising Principle in Horace's *Epodes?*," *Akterion* 45: 37–51.
Thomas, R. (2001) *Virgil and the Augustan Reception* (Cambridge).
Thomson, D.F.S. (1970) "Catullus 64,196," *RhM* 113: 89–91.
Thummer, E. (1962) "Zur Deutung der 16. Epode des Horaz," in *Serta philologica Aenipontana* 1 (Innsbruck) 343–346.
Traill, D.A. (1979) "Horace, Odes 1.14; genealogy, courtesans and Cyclades," in Deroux (1979) 266–270.
Tsouna, V. (2007) *The Ethics of Philodemus* (Oxford).
———. (2009) "Epicurean Therapeutic Strategies," in Warren (2009) 249–265.
Turner, V. (1967) *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual* (Ithaca, NY).
———. (1974) *Drama, Fields, and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society* (Ithaca, NY).
Vernant, J.-P. (1974) *Mythe et société en Grèce ancienne* (Paris); trans. J. Lloyd (1980) *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece* (Sussex).
———, and Burkertidal-Naquet, P. (1972) *Mythe et Tragedie en Grèce ancienne* (Paris); trans. J. Lloyd (1981) *Tragedy and Myth in Ancient Greece* (Sussex).
Verrall, A.W. (1884), *Studies, Literary and Historical, in the Odes of Horace* (New York); reprint (1924).
Versnel, H.S. (1998) "καὶ εἴ τι λ[οιπὸν] τῶν μερ[ῶ]ν [ἔσ]ται τοῦ σώματος ὅλ[ο]υ[.. (… and any other part of the entire body there may be …): An Essay on Anatomical Curses," in Graf (1998) 217–267.
Vickers, B., ed. (1982) *Rhetoric Revalued: Papers from the International Society for the History of Rhetoric* (Binghamton, NY).
Viereck, H.D.L. (1975) *Die römische Flotte*: *Classis Romana* (Herford).
Vretska, K. (1971) "Horatius, Carm. I, I," *Hermes* 99: 323–335.
Vürtheim, J. (1919) *Stesichoros' Fragmente und Biographie* (Leiden).
Wagenvoort, H. (1956) "The Crime of Fratricide (Hor. *Epod.* 7, 18): The Figure of Romulus-Quirinus in the Political Struggle of the Ist Century BC," in *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion* (Leiden) 169–183; reprint (New York, 1968: Greenwood Press).
Warren, J., ed. (2009) *The Cambridge Companion to Epicureanism* (Cambridge).
Watson, L.C. (1983) "Two Problems in Horace *Epode* 3," *Philologus* 127: 80–86.
———. (1983b) "The Iambist as Sheep-Dog: Horace, *Epode* VI 7–8," *Mnemosyne* 36: 156–159.
———. (1987) "*Epode* 9, or the Art of Falsehood," in Whitby, Hardie, and Whitby (1987) 119–129.
———. (1991) *Arae: The Curse Poetry of Antiquity* (Leeds).

———. (1995) "Horace's *Epodes*: The Impotence of *Iambos*?," in Harrison (1995) 188–202.
———. (2007) "The *Epodes*: Horace's Archilochus?," in Harrison (2007) 93–104.
West, D. (1967) *Reading Horace* (Edinburgh).
———. (1995) *Horace Odes I: Carpe Diem* (Oxford).
West, M.L. (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin).
Whitby, Michael; Hardie, P.; and Whitby, M., edd. (1987) *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol).
White, L.M., (2004) "A Measure of *Parrhesia*: The State of the Manuscript of PHerc. 1471," in Fitzgerald, Obbink, and Holland (2004) 103–130.
White, P. (1993) *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge, MA).
Wiechers, A. (1961) *Aesop in Delphi* (Meisenheim am Glam).
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. (1913) *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker* (Berlin).
Wilkinson, L. (1945) *Horace and His Lyric Poetry* (Cambridge).
Williams, B. (1993) *Shame and Necessity* (Berkeley).
Williams, G. (1968) *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford).
———. (1980) *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (New Haven, CT).
Wimmel, W (1953) "Über das Verhältnis der 4. Ecloge zur 16. Epode," *Hermes* 81: 317–344.
Winkler, J.J. (1990) *The Constraints of Desire: The Anthropology of Sexual Gender in Ancient Greece* (London).
Winniczuk, L. (1958) "De carminum genere quod propempticon vocatur observationes aliquot," *Meander* 13: 406–419.
Wistrand, E.K.H. (1958) *Horace's Ninth Epode and Its Historical Background* (Göteborg).
Woodbury, L. (1967) "Helen and the Palinode," *Phoenix* 21: 157–176.
Woodman, A.J. (1980) "The Craft of Horace in Odes 1.14," *CP* 75: 60–67.
———. (2003) "Poems to Historians: Catullus 1 and Horace Odes 2.1," in Braund and Gill (2003) 191–216.
———, and West, D., edd. (1984) *Poetry and Politics in the Age of Augustus* (Cambridge).
———, and Feeney, D., edd. (2002) *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace* (Cambridge).
Worman, N. (2008) *Abusive Mouths in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).
Wray, D. (2001) *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood* (Cambridge).
Zanker, P. (1988) *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor).
Zeitlin, F.I. (1996) *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature* (Chicago).
Zumwalt, N.K. (1978) "Horace's *Navis* of Love Poetry (*C.* 1.14)," *CW* 71 (1977) 249–254.

SUBJECT INDEX

Achaeans, 15, 15n29
Achilles, 15n30, 16n32, 104n53, 147n51, 149, 149n53, 166–167, 167n31, 174, 187, 197, 197n32, 207, 270, 271n60
Actium, battle of, 3, 23, 23n46, 24, 25n51, 77, 78n4, 81n1, 82, 85, 112n66, 115, 133–135, 134n25, 177, 229–230
Aeneas, 24, 74n72, 88n24, 161n19, 241n15, 265n52, 269, 271n60
Aeschines, 11n21
Aeschylus, 31n64
Aesop, 15n29, 16n32
Agamemnon, 15n29, 108, 160, 160n18
aging, 1, 25, 66, 68n56, 68n57, 100n48, 101n49, 103n51, 109, 111n63, 124, 126, 126n9, 128n12, 129–130, 130n16, 147n51, 150n55, 233, 233n3, 275
Agrippa, 101n48, 270
Alcaeus, 26, 28, 28n58, 37–38, 39n5, 56–57, 57n40, 59, 201n42, 202n43, 208, 208n51
Alcibiades, 65n49
Alexis, 13n25, 140n39
Alfius, 26–27, 29, 79n5, 87–88, 88n23, 89–92, 91n29, 94–97, 99, 128, 158–159, 158n14, 186–187, 187n12, 227, 252n34
Allobroges, 156, 156n6
ambivalence, 6–7, 7n12, 7n13, 8n15, 63, 63n46, 94n34, 108n58, 132
Amicius, 150n55
Amorphus, 212n56
Amyntas of Cos, 27, 142, 144
Anacreon, 99n45, 150
anger, 3–4, 4n4, 5n8, 8, 11n22, 12, 23n44, 23–25, 34, 35, 36n3, 42, 49n24, 50–51, 53n23
See rage
animals/animalism, 55, 60n42, 69n58, 81, 97, 106–107, 108n58, 114, 124–126, 124n4, 124n6, 129, 142, 156–157, 195, 219, 221, 236–237, 247, 253
Antony, Marc, 22–23, 23n46, 80n9, 81n11, 112n66, 113n67, 115, 135n26, 153n1, 178
Aphrodite, 7n12, 35, 217, 226n77
Apollo, 13, 13n25, 30n62, 33n67, 39, 53, 68n57, 111, 117, 142
Apollonius, 91, 222n69
Aquilo, 137
Archilochean-Lykambid tradition, 11, 11n20, 44–56, 103, 108n58, 121–125, 132, 148, 161, 178, 190, 205n48, 211, 219, 228, 265
Archilochus, 4, 5n7, 6, 11, 11n20, 13n26, 16n32, 18, 26, 25n53, 25n54, 27–28, 28n58, 30n62, 31, 32, 37–38, 38n4, 39, 39n5, 40–76, 41n8, 42n11, 43n13, 44n15, 44n16, 44n17, 45n19, 45n20, 50n26, 52n28, 54n34, 55n36, 56n38, 57n40, 66, 66n54, 68, 70n64, 72n67, 72n68, 75n73, 76n76, 79n8, 103, 103n52, 108n58, 121, 123–125, 125n7, 129n14, 130n16, 132, 136n29, 161, 178, 190, 202n43, 205n48, 211, 219, 228, 230, 265
"Archilochus and His Cow," 66, 68, 76n76, 230
Ares, 7n12, 30n62
Argonauts, 159, 159n16
Ariadne, 169, 202n43
Aristius, 194

Ariston, 164n25
Aristophanes, 17n33, 19n35, 20n37, 31n64, 61–62, 65, 65n49, 70, 93, 117n73, 154, 222n69
  Clouds, 65
  Frogs, 31n64, 154
Aristotle, 4n4, 9n16, 10n18, 12n23, 17, 17n33, 19n36, 64, 64n48, 65–66, 75, 79n8, 89n26, 238n9, 261, 261n45
Asclepiadean meter, 184
Athenis, 33, 145, 234n4
Athens, 22, 31n64, 70, 102n50
Atreus, 108, 220–221, 223
Augustus, 22–23, 23n44, 24n48, 25n51, 28n57, 38, 80, 109
Aulus Gellius, 49
Aurelius, 87, 139, 141
Auster, 137
autonomy, 89n26, 259

Bacchylides, 182n4
"banausic" labor, 89n26
Bathyllus, 150, 150n54
Baubo, 69, 69n58, 100n48
Bellerephon, 225
blame, 1–4, 2n3, 7–8, 11n21, 16, 16n32, 27, 33, 40, 45–47, 52n28, 54–55, 55n37, 62, 64–65, 72n67, 72n68, 89, 98n42, 99, 108n58, 109, 113, 116, 116n72, 124n6, 132, 144, 155–157, 169n33, 177, 204–205, 222n70, 223, 231–234, 233n3, 259
Blessed Isles, 15n29, 29, 89, 153, 157n10, 159, 159n17, 187
Bononia, 80n9
Britain, 113, 113n67
Brutus, 22, 202n43
Bupalus, 31–33, 107, 108n58, 145, 148, 234n4

Caelius, 131n18, 213
Caesar, Julius, 35–36, 47–48, 50, 50n27, 62, 62n45, 78–81, 89, 93, 113n67, 133–134, 136, 149n53, 253n36, 263, 270
Callimachus, 20n36, 26–27, 26n51, 27n56, 28n58, 31, 31n64–66, 32–33, 33n67, 39, 39n6, 40n7, 41, 42n9, 45, 48n23, 49, 55–56, 63n47, 72n67, 79, 81–82, 81n11, 81n12, 91, 96, 126n10, 139n36, 148n52, 169n33, 182n4, 222n69, 230, 252n35
  Aetia, 39, 182n4, 222n70
Calvus, 73n69, 139n33, 140n40, 183, 272n63
Camillus, 153n1, 161
Campanian, 172n37
Canidia, 7–17, 15n29, 15n30, 16n31, 24, 27, 29, 32, 41, 51, 58n40, 74–75, 79n5, 92–94, 96, 100–105, 100n48, 101n49, 103n51, 105n54, 106, 108, 110, 118n75, 129n14, 152, 156, 158n13, 163–179, 163n24, 164n27, 166n29, 167n31, 168n32, 169n33, 170n34, 172n37, 173n40, 174n44, 176n47, 176n48, 178n49, 183, 187, 190–191, 197–198, 201, 203–204, 210, 210n53, 212, 214–215, 215n61, 219–223, 222n71, 223n73, 223n74, 228, 273
  Horace's duet with, 163–179
  singing with, 8–17
Cannae, 153n1, 155
Capua, 154–155
carmina, 7, 12–13, 13n25, 27, 39n5, 136n29, 173, 182n3, 185n8, 201, 207
  See Horace, *Odes*
Castor, 170–171
Carthage, 113, 113n67, 155, 221
Catiline, 111n64, 156, 156n6
Cato, 28, 54–55, 90
Catullus, 38n4, 47, 47n22, 48–52, 59, 63, 73, 73n69, 87, 87n21, 92, 122n3, 125n7, 129, 138–139, 138n31, 139n33, 139n34, 140n40, 141, 141n42, 145n49, 168–171, 170n34, 170n35, 183, 192n21, 195–196, 195n28, 200, 200n39, 206n49, 214n58, 216n62, 272n63

Celeus, 67
centaur, 148–149, 174, 236, 238, 240, 245, 248–249
Chimaera, 83, 83n15, 247, 249
Chiron, 149, 151, 174, 187
Chloë, 101, 192n20
Choerilus, 241n16, 269, 269n57
Choris, 140n38
Chremes, 81, 86, 87n23, 90–91, 93
Christian ritual, 53–54, 53n32, 69n61
Cicero, 11, 11n21, 61n43, 62n45, 75n75, 98n44, 111, 111n64, 131n18, 182n4, 213, 239n11, 240n12, 256n38
Circe, 167, 222n71, 226n78, 228
civil war, 1–5, 2n3, 12n25, 21–24, 23n44, 23n46, 24n48, 36, 51, 74, 76, 77n3, 78n4, 99n45, 100, 108–112, 112n66, 119n79, 131, 132n21, 133, 134n25, 153–154, 156, 159n17, 162, 162n23, 197, 197n31, 201, 203, 221, 233–234
Cleisthenes, 65n49
Cleoboea, 70n64
Cleon, 65n49, 222n69
Cleopatra, 23, 81n11
Clodia, 11n21, 131n18
Clytemnestra, 108
Conon, 164
Corax, 52
Cornarius, 117n73
Corydon, 13n25, 140n39, 211n54
Crates, 17
Cratinus, 61–62
Creusa, 74
Critias, 52n28

Damisippus, 72, 194
Damoetas, 211n54
Danaids, 111, 112n65
Davus, 176n47
Deianira, 92–94, 94n34, 96, 168n32
Delphi, oracle of, 68, 70n64, 117, 119n78
Demeter, 14n27, 18, 30n62, 35, 53n32, 66, 66n54, 67–69, 68n56, 69n57, 69n58, 69n61, 70, 70n64, 71n65, 74, 76n76, 117–118, 125n7, 151n56, 154, 162, 229–230, 273
Demophoön, 67
Demosthenes, 5, 11n21, 240n12
derisor ("scoffer"), 72, 235, 235n5
Diana, 105, 165–166, 240, 252, 256
Dionysus, 6n10, 17n33, 30n62, 31n64, 53n32, 70, 70n64
disyllabics, 196n30
Divine Comedy, 117n74

Egnatius, 48
Egypt, 31, 39, 153
Electra, 194
elegiac tradition, 27n56, 45, 49, 52n28, 75, 125n7, 133n23, 134n25, 135, 138–144, 139n37, 140n40, 143n44, 147, 151, 166–168, 173, 197n33, 198n35, 206n49, 268, 268n56, 275
Elysian Plain, 158n12
Epicureanism, 11n22, 22n41, 119n79, 198n34, 233n3, 237n7, 241n15, 248, 248n27, 248n28, 255, 256n38, 264n52, 268n54
epigrammatic tradition, 45, 72n68, 81n12, 116n72, 126n9, 129n14, 129n15, 131n17, 202n43, 275
Erictho, 100n48, 103n51
Eros, 216n63, 217
Eupolis, 61–62, 65n49, 72
Europa, 159n16
Eurus, 90, 137
Euripides, 6n9, 31n64, 65n49, 166n30, 194n26
  Bacchae, 6n10, 8n15
Euterpe, 184, 189
Evander, 2n3

Faunus, 226–228, 226n78
Flaccus, 62, 143, 143n44
Florus, 80

Furies, 27, 104, 106, 108, 156, 174, 194, 194n26, 197
Furius, 87, 139, 141, 153n1

Gandalf, 111n63
Golden Age, 91n29, 159, 159n15, 269
Gratidia, 101n49, 128n12, 222n71
Greek tragedy, 29n61, 77n1, 110n59, 115
"Gyges," 83n15

Hades, 31n64, 66, 70n64
Hannibal, 153n1, 154–155, 221
Helen, 35, 150, 159n16, 169n33, 170, 170n34, 170n35, 171, 171n36, 200n40, 207, 215, 222, 222n70, 222n71, 226n78, 273
Hellenism, 108n58, 122n3, 129n14, 137n30, 159n17, 188n15, 202, 212n55
Hendacasyllables, 49n24
Herakles, 69n61, 94n34
Hermes, 13, 13n25, 30n63, 71n66, 211, 211n54
Herodotus, 159n16
hexameter, 23, 134, 140n40, 148, 233, 242n17, 246, 246n24, 246n26, 260
hierarchy, 4n4, 9n16, 10n18, 84
Hipponax, 6n9, 16n32, 26, 26n54, 31–33, 31n64, 31n65, 33n67, 38n4, 40n7, 45n19, 47n22, 70n64, 72n67, 98n42, 129n14, 136n29, 140n40, 148, 234n4
Homer, 16n32, 30n63, 54, 66, 71n66, 81n11, 149n53, 158n12, 166–167, 166n30, 182–183, 211, 211n54, 217, 238n9, 269, 271n60
  Iliad, 16n32, 166, 166n30, 271n60
  Odyssey, 7n12, 167
Horace,
  Ars Poetica, 7, 18, 22n40, 29, 33, 37, 43, 115n70, 121, 151, 231–273, 232n2, 234, 234n4
  Carmen Saeculare, 23
  Epistles I, 1, 2n1, 4, 6–7, 18, 20–21, 23–26, 28, 31–32, 37, 39–41, 41n8, 42n12, 43, 43n14, 51, 56, 58n41, 59, 76n76, 88, 96, 103, 107, 110, 114, 114n68, 116, 118, 125n7, 148n52, 150n55, 151, 163, 178, 181, 182n3, 182n4, 181n3, 185n8, 188n14, 194–195, 195n27, 196n29, 196–197, 199, 203, 208, 211, 211n54, 232–233, 235n5, 240, 242–243, 246, 246n24, 246n26, 260, 265
  epistle 1.19, 38–39, 42–43, 42n11, 44n15, 103–104, 131, 139, 182n3, 194n25, 230, 233, 263
  Epistles II, 6, 9n16, 21–23, 25, 58n41, 60, 80, 80n10, 82n13, 82n14, 93, 95, 95n36, 95n37, 96, 117, 144–145, 150n55, 243–244, 269n57
  epode 1, 27, 40n7, 41, 74, 77–89, 79n7, 80n9, 89–93, 89n25, 95n37, 99, 109–110, 115, 119, 121, 125–127, 135, 145n48, 145n52, 148n52, 150n55, 153–154, 177, 185, 219, 229–230
  epode 2, 26–27, 29, 75, 79n5, 87–89, 92, 87n22, 87n23, 88n24, 90–91, 93–95, 94n33, 94n34, 95n37, 97–99, 109–110, 115–116, 119, 121, 125, 128, 153–154, 158, 158n14, 177, 186–187, 186n11, 227–229, 239–240, 252n34
  epode 3, 15, 29, 75, 91–92, 92n32, 94n33, 95–96, 95n37, 99, 109–110, 115–116, 119, 121, 125, 153–154, 177, 187, 219, 229
  epode 4, 47n21, 75, 78n4, 94n33, 94n34, 96, 99, 99n45, 109, 116, 119, 121, 125, 128, 141, 153–154, 177, 229
  epode 5, 15n30, 26–27, 29, 60n42, 74–75, 79n5, 93, 100–109, 105n54, 116, 118n75, 119, 121, 125, 154, 165–166, 167n31, 168, 171–172, 172n37, 172n38,

174–176, 174n44, 177, 187, 197, 203, 223, 229
epode 6, 15, 41, 26n54, 32, 56, 59, 60n42, 74, 100–110, 108n58, 111n64, 114, 116, 119, 121, 124n4, 125, 154, 171, 176–177, 203–205, 211n54, 229
epode 7, 2n3, 15, 23n44, 23n46, 26, 29, 74, 77n1, 91, 109–119, 110n60, 111n62, 111n64, 112n66, 119, 121, 121n1, 124n4, 125, 131, 153–155, 177, 197, 203, 204n47, 205n48, 229, 233n3
epode 8, 8, 41, 75, 93, 119, 121–134, 121n1, 122n3, 124n4, 129n14, 129n15, 130n15, 131n17, 132–134, 132n21, 136–137, 144, 144n47, 151, 154, 162, 177, 204, 204n47, 229
epode 9, 121n1, 122, 133–136, 134n25, 136, 142–143, 151, 150n55, 154, 162, 203, 204n47, 205n48, 219, 229, 268n55
epode 10, 26–27, 74, 93, 119, 122, 125n8, 136–138, 141n41, 150n55, 151, 154, 162, 173–174, 177–204, 211n54, 229
epode 11, 75, 119, 122, 138–144, 140n40, 150n55, 154, 162, 229
epode 12, 27, 32, 51, 73–75, 93, 119, 122, 129n15, 131n17, 138, 142, 144–147, 151, 154, 162, 168, 174, 177, 197–198, 203, 207n50, 229, 250, 250n30
epode 13, 76n77, 119, 122, 146–147, 147n51, 149, 150n55, 154, 162, 174, 187, 188n14, 229
epode 14, 22, 29, 75, 78n4, 119, 121–122, 144, 146–152, 148n52, 154, 162, 229
epode 15, 27, 41n8, 119, 122, 138, 142, 151, 154, 158, 162, 229
epode 16, 17n33, 23n46, 24, 29, 74, 78n4, 90, 91n29, 104n53, 119, 122, 134n25, 147n51, 152, 153–162, 153n1, 153n4, 158n11, 160n18, 161n21, 174–175, 175n46, 178, 187, 199, 212n54, 219, 221–222, 227, 229
epode 17, 24, 32–33, 41, 51, 74–76, 100n48, 103n51, 119, 122, 129n14, 133, 152, 163–179, 163n24, 164n27, 170n34, 170n35, 172, 175, 175n46, 176–178, 181, 185, 187, 197, 203–204, 211n54, 212, 215, 215n60, 215n61, 261n62, 219–220, 219n65, 220n67, 222, 222n71, 222n74, 228–229
Odes, 2n1, 2n3, 3, 7, 12, 17, 23, 23n45, 29, 38, 39n5, 41n8, 57n40, 75, 85, 136, 150n55, 173n42, 178, 181–200, 182n4, 184n7, 183–200, 194n24, 203n44, 205n48, 209–230, 223, 223n72, *226–2231*, 231n1, 233, 259n42, 270n58
Odes I, 178, 181–182, 205n48, 270n58
Odes I–III, 23, 23n45, 38, 136
Odes III, 173n42
Odes IV, 23, 23n45, 41n8, 231, 231n1, 241n15, 259n42
Satires, 22n43, 23n45, 32, 72n67, 87–88, 134, 176, 184–185, 187, 259, 265
Satires I, 87–88, 176
Human Aggression (Storr), 4n4, 9n17
The Human Stain (Roth), 132n21
Hymn to Demeter, 117–118, 154, 230
Hymn to Hermes, 13, 30n63, 71n66, 211, 211n54
Hymn to Mercury, 30n63, 71n66, 211n54
Hypermestra, 197n33
hypocrisy, 91, 94, 94n33, 98–99, 129n15, 141

"I," 1–6, 21n40, 84, 89, 162n23, 188n13

Iambe, 18, 30n62, 66n54, 67–69, 68n57, 71n65, 76n76, 100n48, 124n6, 125n7, 162, 229
Iambi, 6n11, 20n36, 27n56, 31, 72n67, 81n12, 184
iambic aesthetic, 14, 33, 62n45, 122, 178n49
iambic couplets, 229
iambic criticism, 5, 5n6, 11–12, 15, 15n30, 21, 24–25, 28–29, 33, 38, 43, 63, 97, 112n66, 118, 121–122, 133, 151, 151n56, 162–165, 181, 190, 209, 211, 212n55, 221, 231, 265
iambic drama, 6–8, 109, 123, 152
iambic invective, 4, 6, 8, 11, 8n14, 54, 118, 151n56, 222n69
iambic-lyric praxis, 5, 8, 8n15, 10, 23n45, 29, 34, 36–38, 42, 73n70, 76, 78n4, 112n66, 119, 121, 148, 151, 151n56, 181–182, 211, 234–235, 246
iambic tradition, 2n3, 6–21, 21n39, 32, 39, 72n68, 84–85, 108n58, 122, 122n3, 131n19, 230, 234n4
iambikē poiēsis, 7, 17–34, 230, 231
Illyria, 113n67
Inachia, 27, 131n17, 140, 144–146, 196, 198, 203
Io, 159n16
Iphigenia, 108
Isocrates, 170n35

jealousy, 98n44, 113, 130, 199, 217
Jove, 28n57, 36, 134–135, 137, 174, 220

Kerkopes, 124n6
Kore, 14n27

Lady Justice, 1, 275
Latium, 18, 25, 37–38
Leimones, 68
Leontius, 102n50
Lesbia, 21n40, 27, 56–57, 87, 125n7, 133–134, 139, 146, 167, 184, 189, 208–209, 228
libertas, 61, 97n41, 116n72
Liburnians, 81n11
licentia, 60, 97n41
Ligurinus, 167, 263, 263n48
liminal characters, 15–16, 100n48
Lincoln, Abraham, 1–2, 4, 4n4
literati, 31, 44n15
Lucilius, 38n4, 39n6, 61–62, 139n33, 233n3, 240n12
Lucius, 102n50
Lucretilis, 227, 227n79
Lycaeus, 227
Lydia, 78n4, 98n42, 129n13, 129n15, 192–197, 192n21, 192n22, 192n23, 197n32, 198–199, 199n38, 200–202, 263, 268n56
Lykambes, 4, 6, 15n29, 18, 21, 27, 27n55, 35, 37, 44, 44n16, 45–47, 47n21, 51, 53–54, 57, 58n41, 59–60, 63, 65, 66n54, 97n40, 104, 107, 108n58, 131, 139, 142, 145, 151, 163, 177–178, 191, 203, 213
Lykambids, 4–6, 11, 26, 31–32, 39n5, 42n10, 44–56, 44n15, 44n16, 57n40, 61, 63, 65–66, 71, 73, 76, 97n41, 100–109, 113–114, 119, 121–125, 132, 136, 138–139, 145–146, 148, 151–152, 161–162, 174, 177–178, 181, 190–191, 191n19, 205n48, 207, 207n50, 210–213, 219, 222n69, 224n75, 225, 228, 230, 265
  and Archilochus
    See Archilochean-Lykambid tradition
  “mentality” of, 6, 132, 145, 205n48
  tradition of
    See Lykambid tradition
Lykambid tradition, 4–5, 65, 122–123, 136, 162, 181, 207n50, 210, 212–213, 230
Lynceus, 197n33
Lucian, 45n19, 50n26
Lucilius, 38n4, 39n6, 61–62, 139n33, 233n3, 240n12

Lyce, 110n60, 129n14, 129n15, 206n49, 233n3, 237n6, 259n42, 268n56
Lyde, 197n33, 226n77
lyre, 7, 12–13, 13n25, 30n63, 36, 53, 57n40, 68, 71n66, 76n77, 87, 125n7, 134, 136, 153–179, 181, 182n3, 184–185, 189, 191–192, 192n20, 197n32, 197n33, 207–209, 211, 211n54, 215, 215n61, 223n74, 227–228, 263, 267, 270, 271n59
lyric tradition, 7–8, 7n13, 12–14, 12n23, 12n24, 13n26, 16n31, 19–23, 21n40, 25, 28, 37–39, 39n5, 56–58, 57n40, 86, 119, 125n7, 126n9, 129, 131n17, 133–136, 134n24, 134n25, 147n51, 148–150, 163–166, 163n24, 170, 170n34, 174, 177–178, 181–230, 182n2, 182n4, 183n5, 184n6, 184n7, 192n20, 197n33, 199n38, 202n43, 204n46, 205n48, 207n50, 214n58, 223n72, 226n77, 226n78, 227n79, 231n1, 233–234, 246, 259n41, 262–263, 268n55, 275
Lysias, 217–218, 218n64

Maecenas, 22, 22n43, 24n48, 25n51, 27–28, 28n58, 29, 32, 35–36, 41, 77–89, 77n2, 78n4, 80n9, 84n17, 87n23, 89, 89n25, 91–94, 94n34, 97–98, 100n48, 107, 112n66, 121–122, 126, 127n11, 133–134, 134n25, 135, 145n48, 146–152, 148n52, 150n54, 150n55, 163n24, 165, 167, 185, 187, 190–191, 190n18, 203, 203n44, 219, 225, 227
Maenads, 182n3
Maevius, 26–27, 93, 125n8, 136–138, 141n41, 142, 151, 174, 204
magic, 61n43, 69n61, 100n48, 102n50, 129n14, 163, 163n24, 166–168, 166n29, 173, 175, 177–178, 187, 211n54
Mamurra, 47–48, 170n34
Martial, 45–46, 72n68
"Masque of the Read Death" (Poe), 59n41
Medea, 92–94, 94n35, 96, 101n49, 103n51, 159, 159n16, 168
Meleager, 20n36
Meliboeus, 211n54
Melpomene, 267–268, 268n55, 271
Menalcus, 211n54
Menander, 72
Menoetes, Arcadian, 88n24
Metanaira, 18, 67, 74, 118, 229
metaphor, 9n17, 27, 27n56, 44, 93, 94n34, 100n48, 101n49, 108n58, 124n4, 126, 126n10, 129n15, 162, 167–168, 191, 201, 201n42, 202n43, 205, 216n63, 227, 230, 234, 256, 257n39, 258
Metellus Scipio, 55, 85–86
meter, 1, 18, 20–21, 23, 27n56, 37, 42, 42n12, 47n22, 48n23, 51, 56–57, 57n39, 57n40, 58, 63–64, 72n67, 75, 77, 79, 87, 96–97, 121, 134, 140n40, 148, 182, 182n3, 182n4, 184, 200, 205, 226, 229, 233, 242n17, 246, 246n24, 26, 260, 263
Mimnes, 33, 234n4
Mnesiepes Inscription (3rd century BC), 52, 52n29, 55, 66, 70n64, 125n7
mockery, 5n8, 6, 6n10, 8–9, 11n21, 11n22, 12n23, 15, 15n28, 17n33, 18, 21, 32–34, 49, 56, 60, 65–73, 65n49, 66n54, 68n56, 68n57, 71n65, 88, 98, 100n48, 105n54, 116–118, 124n6, 126, 142, 145n49, 151, 174n44, 181, 195, 204, 209, 231, 234, 237, 238n8, 249, 267
"Mockery of Demeter," 66–67, 66n54
Murrucinus, Asinius, 48, 85
Muses, 35, 37, 52–53, 57, 68, 73, 76n76, 81, 81n12, 85–86, 125n7, 164, 184, 188, 208, 211n54, 258n55, 273

Nautes, 269, 270n58
Neaera, 27, 142–144, 151, 157–158
Neobule, 44, 44n16, 97n40, 130n16
Nonius, 47, 51

Octavian, 3, 17, 22, 23n46, 24, 24n48, 32, 80, 80n9, 81, 81n11, 82, 84, 91, 98n44, 99–100, 100n60, 111–112, 112n66, 113n67, 115, 133, 134n25, 229, 233n3, 253n36
Odysseus, 15n29, 16n32, 167, 222n71, 228
Old Comedy, 17n33, 18, 61, 61n43, 61n44, 62, 65, 72, 72n67, 116n71, 116n72
Orestes, 108, 194–195, 194n26, 195n27
Orpheus, 182n3, 267, 269, 271, 271n61
Ovid, 1, 27, 27n56, 30, 45, 45n19, 52n28, 63, 124n6, 140n40, 182n3, 214n58, 272n64

Pacorus, 113n67
Pactumeius, 103n51, 172, 172n37, 222n71
Palaemon, 211n54
Palatine Hill, 2n3
Palinode, 15n30, 170, 170n35, 171n36, 173, 181, 212, 212n56, 214n57, 215, 215n60, 216–219, 216n62, 216n63, 219n65, 222, 222n71, 224n75, 225, 226n78
Pamphile, 100n48, 102n50
Pan, 13n25, 227
Parian iambs, 4–5, 18, 26n54, 37–38, 39n5, 43, 56, 57n40, 59, 75–76
Paris, 150, 171, 200n40, 207, 215, 222n69, 222n71
Paros, 44, 52, 68, 70n64
Parthia, 3, 112n66, 113–114, 113n67
Patroclus, 104n53, 149n53
Pelops, 220, 223, 226n78, 270
Penelope, 222n71, 226n78, 228
Persephone, 66, 125n7
Persians, 157n10, 159n16, 159n17
Perusine War (41–40 BC), 3
Pettius, 27, 138
Phantaste, 212n56
pharmakos, 8n15, 15n30, 16n32, 66n52, 98n42, 100n48, 178n49
Phidias, 33n67
Philippi, 22, 25n50
Philodemus, 11n22, 57n40, 129n14, 130, 131n17, 233n3, 248n28, 261, 261n45, 268n54
Phocaeans, 157n10
Phoenicians, 159, 159n16, 159n17
Phryne, 148, 150
Phyllis, 98n44, 111, 225
Pindar, 55, 108n58, 124n6, 134n25, 188n13, 189–190, 202n43
Piso, L. Calpurnius, 257n39, 268n54
Plato, 8n15, 11n20, 15n30, 72, 116–117, 170n35, 216, 218n64
  Phaedrus, 11n20, 15n30, 216–218, 218n64
  Philebus, 117, 117n73
Plautus, 73, 92n31, 111n64, 149n53
  Captivi, 95
  Menaechmi, 92n31, 95
Pliny, 139n35
Plutarch, 9n16, 45n20
Pollio, Asinius, 85
Pollux, 170–171
polyeideia, 12, 12n24, 21n39, 119, 121–122, 178, 229n81, 230
Polygnotus, 70n64
Polyhymnia, 184, 189, 208–209
Pompeius, Sextus, 23, 23n46, 47, 99–100, 100n48, 99n45, 112, 112n66, 115, 135n26, 197n31, 202
Porphyrio, 99n47, 174n44, 202n43
"pretenders," 182n4, 217, 235, 235n5
Priam, 159n16, 166, 167, 167n31
Prometheus, 74, 209n52, 210, 213, 220, 220n68, 238n8
Propertius, 3, 268n56
Proserpina, 165–166
Proteus, 225
Pylades, 150n54, 194, 194n26
Pyrrha, 191–192, 205, 221
Pythian, 52–54, 210, 216n63

Quintilian, 202n43

Quintilius Varus, 233n3, 235, 265–273
Quirinus, 154–155, 157, 175

Rabelais, 116, 116n72
Ravidus, 49–51, 50n26, 145n49
rage, 4, 6–8, 12, 11n22, 17, 37, 39n5, 41–47, 42n10, 54, 59n3, 60, 74, 77–119, 121–152, 158, 158n13, 161–164, 167, 167n31, 173, 176–181, 191n21, 195–199, 201–203, 205, 207, 210, 210n53, 213, 214n58, 219, 219n65, 220–221, 223n17, 224n75, 225, 256, 271n60
  iambic, 158, 158n13
  rage-repression-rage, 121–152
  rage-revenge paradigm, 176–181
  society and self-destruction, 77–119
reciprocity, 6, 6n10, 8n15, 10n18, 11n21, 11n22, 13, 13n25, 17n32, 58, 75–76, 106n56, 119, 144, 163n24, 211, 211n54, 216, 219, 226n77
recusatio, 62n45, 80, 80n10, 82n13, 148n52, 263
Regulus, M. Atilius, 155n3, 188n13
ritual, 5n8, 6n9, 6n10, 8–9, 8n14, 8n15, 9n16, 9n17, 10n18, 11, 11n21, 15, 15n28, 15n29, 16, 17n33, 18, 19n35, 30–32, 30n62, 30n63, 35n1, 47n21, 53n32, 66n52, 66n54, 68, 68n57, 69n60, 69–71, 70n62, 70n63, 70n64, 71n65–68, 73–74, 73n70, 76n76, 116–118, 118n75, 118n77, 122, 133n22, 146n50, 151–152, 162, 166, 168, 176–177, 190n18, 212, 214n58, 216n63, 217, 230, 273
ritual laughter, 6n10, 8n14, 17n33, 35n1, 71n65, 71n66, 73n70
Romulus, 2, 109n59, 112–115, 155, 155n4, 221

Sagana, 100n48, 175–176
Sallust, 111n64, 156n6
Sappho, 16n32, 26, 28, 28n58, 37–38, 56–57, 57n40, 59, 76n76, 87n21, 140, 195–196, 195n28, 200, 200n39, 208, 227n79
satire, 5, 5n8, 19n35, 21–22, 39n6, 40n7, 61–62, 62n45, 63n46, 71–73, 72n68, 78n4, 80, 97, 105n54, 110, 111n63, 125–126, 151n56, 176n47, 194–195, 195n27, 233–234, 253n36
Saturnalia, 72, 72n68, 73n69, 183–184
Scaliger, 209n52
scapegoats, ix, 6, 6n9, 9n17, 15, 15n28, 15n29, 15n30, 16n32, 47n21, 178
Scarlet Letter (Hawthorne), 58n41
scholiasts, 57n40, 101n49, 136n29, 202n43, 219n65, 222n71, 226n78
Semonides, 30n62, 45n19, 72n67, 124–125, 124n6, 204
Seneca, 72n68
  Apocolocyntosis, 72n68
Sertorius, Quintus, 157n10
Sestius, 188n14
sexuality/sex, 5n8, 11n19, 44, 51, 62, 68–69, 69n61, 73, 74, 78n4, 92–94, 101n49, 121–126, 124n4, 126n9, 128n12, 129–130, 129n15, 132n21, 135n26, 138, 144–146, 164n27, 168, 196, 198, 202n43, 208, 222n69, 227–228
shaming, 4, 6, 5n8, 9n17, 11, 18, 30, 32, 52n28, 64–65, 66n52, 73, 116, 116n72, 118, 118n76, 132n21, 133, 141, 141n41, 153n1, 169–170, 216n63, 217, 258n40
Simonides, 182n4
Sirmio, 48n23
societas, 5, 9, 237, 272
Socrates, 15n30, 65, 65n49, 116–117, 117n73, 119n78, 216–219, 216n63, 218n64
Solon, 114n68, 191n19
sophism, 15n30
Spartan, 45, 45n20
spite, 5, 24, 116, 177, 197–199, 207

Stertinius, 194–195, 194n26, 195n27
Stesichorus, 16, 170, 170n34, 35, 36, 208, 215, 215n60, 216–218, 219n65, 222, 222n71, 226n78
The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, 237
Syria, 113n67

Tantalus, 220, 223
Telephus, 15n30, 110n60, 166, 166n30, 167, 192n21, 193–194, 193n23, 196–199, 197n32
Telesicles, 68, 125n7
testimonia, 44n15, 47, 52
tetrameter, 47n22, 51
Thaliarchus, 190, 223n72
Theophrastus, 8n15, 222n69, 258n40
Thallus, 47
Thersites, 15, 15n29, 16n32
Thyestes, 108, 210, 213, 220–221, 223
transgression, 7–10, 8n15, 9n17, 11–12, 11n19, 11n22, 12, 15, 17, 29, 71n65, 100n48, 116n72, 117, 133, 133n22, 164, 164n26, 164n27, 178, 191, 199, 207, 230, 232, 241, 255, 257–258, 265, 272, 272n64
Trebatius, 20, 62, 62n45
trimeter, 47n22, 48n23, 182n3
Troy, 6n11, 15n29, 74n72, 137, 150, 160
Tyndaris, 103n51, 222, 222n71, 226, 226n78, 227–228

Ulysses, 159, 159n16, 270
U.S. Civil War, 1–2, 4, 23
unity, 7, 11–12, 17, 19–20, 76, 84–85, 121–122, 133, 151, 190n18, 218n64, 226n78, 230, 232n2, 236, 246, 249, 250n31, 254, 256n38, 261, 263
See polyeideia
utopia, 90, 147n51, 153, 157–158, 158n11, 158n14, 159n17, 187, 227, 239–240

Varius, L. Rufus, 265–266, 268n54, 269n57
Varus, P. Alfenus, 102, 104, 125n7, 165, 168, 174, 174n44, 268n54
Vatinius, P., 47, 51
vengeance, 6–7, 11n22, 12n24, 15, 24, 51, 56, 76, 104–109, 112–113, 131–132, 140, 161, 163, 170, 178–179, 192, 221, 229
Ventidius, 98n44, 113n67
Venus, 25, 192–193, 192n20, 193n23, 197, 265n52
Vergil, 2n1, 2n3, 10n18, 13n25, 20n36, 23n44, 24, 24n48, 81, 84n17, 85, 88n24, 91n29, 137n30, 138n31, 150n55, 158n11, 159n15, 161n19, 182n4, 183, 186n11, 190n18, 211n54, 225, 233n3, 241n15, 265–268, 268n54, 268n56, 269, 269n57, 270–271, 270n58, 271n60, 271n61, 272, 272n63, 272n65
Aeneid, 2n1, 23n44, 24, 88n24, 183, 241n15, 269, 270n58, 271n61
Eclogues, 2n1, 10n18, 20n36, 23n44
Volusius, 48, 214n58

witches, 10–11, 15, 16n31, 24, 32, 74, 92–93, 100–106, 100n48, 103n51, 109, 116, 118n75, 156, 163–172, 166n29, 172n37, 172n39, 173, 174n44, 175–176, 185, 207, 220, 223, 273

Zeus, 33n67, 35, 66, 124

INDEX NOMINUM

Ableitinger-Grünberger, D., 112n66, 157n10
Abrahams, R.D., 73n70
Acosta-Hughes, B., 33n67, 42n9, 234n4, 252n36
Adkin, N., 53n32
Aloni, A., 57n40
Alston, W.P., 214n57
Alvar Ezquerra, A., 139n37
Anderson, W.S., 201n42, 202n43
Armstrong, D., 231n1, 232n2, 250n31, 256n38, 257n39, 261n44, 261n45, 261n46, 264n51, 268n54
Arthur, M., 69n58

Babcock, B.A., 80n9, 128n12, 147n51
Baiter, I.G., 190n18
Bakhtin, M.M., 73n70, 116n71
Barchiesi, A., 8n14, 16n31, 19, 20n36, 21n39, 31n66, 36, 40n7, 77n3, 81n12, 91n28, 100n48, 139n36, 163n24, 164n27, 166n29, 166n33, 177, 182n2, 182n4, 183n5, 214n57
Barra, G., 158n11
Bartels, C., 134n25
Bascom, W., 66n54
Bauman, R., 73n70
Ben-Ze'ev, A., 19n35
Bentley, R., 57, 57n40, 83n15, 109n59, 219n65, 209n52, 231n1, 240n14, 263, 263n48
Bickel, E., 50n27
Blanchot, M., 8n15, 11n22
Bond, R., 22
Bonfante, L., 69n58
Bowie, A.M., 30n62, 33n68, 66n54, 70n64
Bowra, C.M., 170n35
Branham, B.R., 73n70
Braund, S., 61n43, 63n46, 97n41
Bremmer, 15n28
Brink, C.O., 231, 231n1, 232n2, 242, 242n17, 244n20, 246n24, 251n33, 259n41, 261n45, 262n47, 264n49
Brown, C. (1997), 43n13, 47n21, 54n34, 69n60, 70n64, 73, 73n70
Brown, T.S. (1946), 159n17
Bücheler, F., 134n25
Bundy, E.L., 186n10
Burckhardt, J., 63n46
Burkert, W., 8n15, 9n16, 10n18, 15n28, 19n34, 47n21, 66n54, 69n60, 70n63, 71n65, 73n70, 118n75, 119n78
Burnett, A.P., 108n58

Cairns, F., 136n29, 137n30, 139n37, 139n37, 143n44, 163n24, 170n35, 204n46, 205n48, 206n49, 214n58, 215n61, 216n62, 224n75, 268n55
Campbell, A.Y., 19n35, 112n66, 141n41, 150n55, 163n24, 165n28, 175n46, 184n6, 220n67, 229n81
Carey, C., 26n53, 26n54, 30n62, 33n68, 47n21, 57n39, 97n40
Carlin, George, 9n17
Carrière, J.C., 70n73
Carrubba, Robert W., 36, 36n2
Cávarzere, A., 36, 112n66, 160n18, 162n23
Chaniotis, A., 44n15
Clarke, J.R., 11n19
Clausen, W., 158n11
Clay, D., 68n56
Clayman, D.L., 36, 42n9, 126n10, 129n14, 252n35
Clinton, K., 14n27, 69n60

Cody, J.V., 184n6, 186n10, 187n12, 188n13, 190n17
Cohen, D., 61n43
Collinge, N.E., 188n13, 189n16, 226n78
Commager, S., 147n51, 184n6, 186n10, 189n16, 193n23, 199, 202n43, 206n49, 212n55, 216n62, 224n75, 227n79, 227n80, 271n61
Compton, T.M., 16n32, 47n21, 65n49
Connor, P., 184n6, 186n10, 187n12, 189n16, 193n23, 212n55, 214n58, 216n62, 224n75
Conte, G.B., 5n7, 25n50
Copley, F.O., 139n37
Corbeill, A., 54n35
Cucchiarelli, A., 36

D'Arms, J.H., 101n40, 172n37
Daube, D., 211n54
Davis, G., 13n26, 97n40, 182n2, 188n13, 202n43, 207n50, 214n58, 224n75
Davis, N.Z. (1975), 9
Degani, H., 136n29
Derrida, Jacques, 8n15, 11n20, 14n27, 15n28, 15n30, 16n32, 218n64
DeVivo, A., 112n66
Dilke, O.A.W., 231n1
Dover, K.J., 19n35, 57n39, 114n68
Dowden, K., 66n54
Drexler, H., 156n6, 159n17
Drusus, 83n15, 98n44
Dunn, F.M., 184n6, 186n10, 188n13, 188n15, 189n16
Durkheim, E., 29n61
Dyson, M., 212n55, 224n75

Easterling, P.E., 30n62
Edmunds, L., 66n54
Edwards, A.T., 116n72
Eidinow, J.S.C., 182n4, 190n18
Ellis, R., 192n21
Emerson, C., 73n70

Falkner, T., 128n12, 129n14
Feeney, D.C., 23n44, 40n7, 43n14, 61n43, 182n4, 184n6, 266n53
Ferguson, J., 159n17
Fiore, B., 53n32
Fitzgerald, T.J. (1996), 53n32
Fitzgerald, W. (1988), 20–21, 36, 40n7, 41n8, 92n32, 94n34, 128n12
Foley, H.P., 66n53, 67n56, 69n58, 60, 69n61
Fontenrose, J., 66n54
Forsdyke, S., 8n15, 9n16, 61n43
Foucault, Michel, 5n5, 8n15, 9n17, 11n22, 14n27, 118n75, 119n78
Fowler, D., 87n23, 233n3, 257
Fraenkel, E., 57n40, 62n45, 92n32, 105n54, 112n66, 122n3, 128n12, 129n14, 134n25, 137n30, 150n55, 159n17, 160n18, 170n34, 184, 184n6, 184n7, 195n28, 200n39, 201n41, 201n42, 202n43, 222n71, 226n78
Freudenburg, Kirk, 5, 61n44, 97n41
Friedrich,G., 192n21
Frischer, B., 231n1
Fuchs, H., 160n18

Gagnè, R., 47
Garrison, D.H., 150n55
Gerber, D.E., 44n15, 44n16, 53n31
Ghiselli, A., 186n10
Giarratano, L., 112n66, 129n15
Girard, R., 4n4, 12n24, 15n28, 15n30, 29n60, 29n61, 77n1, 119n80
Gold, B., 185n9
Golden, L., 232n2, 262n47
Gowers, E., 95n35, 101n49, 122n3, 128n12
Gowing, A.M., 112n66
Graf, F., 72n68, 73n70
Grassmann, V., 129n14
Graver, M., 108n58
Griffiths, A., 19n35, 216n62, 222n70, 222n71, 226n78

Hadot, P., 8n15
Hahn, E.A., 101n49, 103n51, 170n34, 172n34, 222n71, 226n78
Halliwell, Stephen, 8n14, 8n15, 9n17, 10n18, 11n21, 11n22, 13n25, 14n27, 15n29, 17n33, 19n35, 36n3, 55n32, 61n43, 64n48, 65n49, 65n50, 68n57, 69n59, 70n62, 71n65, 71n66, 72n62, 73n70, 116, 116n71, 116n72
Hardin, R.F., 9n16, 30n62, 66n54
Hardison, O.B., Jr., 232n2, 262n47
Harley, D., 172n39
Harriott, R.M., 108n58
Harris, W.V., 23n44, 36n3, 224n75
Harrison, G. (1987), 62n45
Harrison, J.E. (1903), 15n28
Harrison, S.J., 20n36, 20n37, 40, 21n40, 23n44, 25n51, 61n44, 75n73, 81n12, 87n23, 99n46, 111n62, 133n22, 138n32, 156n7, 159n16, 181n1, 182n2, 197n33, 200n40, 261n45
Harrison, T. (2007), 30n62
Haupt, M., 105n55
Hawkins, T., 47n21
Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 58n40
Heath, M., 218n64
Heinze, R., 134n24, 183n5
Hembold, W.C., 218n64
Henderson, J., 36, 97n40, 122n3, 124n4, 129n13, 129n15, 129n15
Hermann, G, 190n18
Hills, P.D., 128n12
Hirschfelder, 190n18
Holder, A., 219n65
Holther, W.B., 218n64
Holzberg, N., 79n6
Hooke, S.H., 66n54
Hooley, D.M., 100n48
Hornblower, S., 12n24, 13n26
Houghton, L.B.T., 108n58
Housman, A.E., 57n40, 127n11, 134n25, 151n55, 244n20
Hubbard, M., 19n35, 20n37, 25n51, 116n72, 117n73, 195n28, 270n58
Hughes, D., 15n28
Hughes, J.K., 54n35
Hutchinson, G., 20

Ingallina, S., 100n48

Jäger, F., 137
Janko, R., 64n48
Jenkyns, R., 224n75, 227n75, 227n79
Jocelyn, H.D., 202n32
Johnson, Timothy S., 1–6, 2n2, 24n47, 41n8, 62n45, 80n10, 84n17, 85n18, 89n26, 98n44, 110n60, 112n66, 112n66, 126n9, 134n24, 134n25, 135n27, 147n51, 148n52, 149n53, 150n55, 155n5, 181n1, 183n5, 192n20, 197n33, 199n38, 241n16, 271n61
Johnson, W.R., 181
Jonson, Ben, 212n56

Kaster, R.A., 36n3
Keller, O., 219n65, 222n71
Keyser, P., 193n23, 194n24, 195n28
Kilpatrick, R., 232n2, 237n7, 256n38
Kipling, 188n13
Kirk, G.S., 66n54, 136n29
Kirkwood, G.M., 136n29
Kirn, B., 129n14
Konstan, D., 4n4, 11n22, 233n3
Kraggerud, E., 80n9, 105n55, 112n66
Kroll, W., 81n21, 140n40
Kukula, R.C., 160n18

La Penna, A., 184n6
Leeman, A.D., 62n45
Lewinsky, Monica, 132n21
Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., 100n48
Lindo, L.I., 170n34
Lorenz, Konrad, 10n18
Lowrie, M., 7, 7n13, 42n12, 62n45, 147n51, 149n53, 163n24, 164n26, 170n34, 197n33, 202n43, 205n48, 271n61

Luck, G., 139n37
Lyne, R.O.A.M., 184n6, 190n18

MacKay, L.A., 224n75
Macleod, C.W., 156n7, 156n8
Mankin, D., 79n8, 99n47, 101n49, 112n66, 128n12, 129n14, 130, 141n41, 143n44, 149n53, 170n34, 172, 174n44
Manning, C.E., 101n49
Marcovich, M., 98n44
Maurach, G., 186n10, 232n2
Maurenbrecher, B., 157n10
Mayer, R., 40n7, 57n40, 151n57
McDonough, C.M., 103n51
McHardy, F., 61n43
McKeown, J.C., 140n40, 253n36
McMahon, J.M., 128n12
Mendell, C.W., 201n42, 202n43
Merrill, E.T., 50n27, 54n35
Miller, P.A., 13n26, 15n30, 16n32, 21n39, 33n68, 70n64, 71n65, 73n70, 139n37
Miralles, C., 52n28, 72n68, 97n40
Mitscherlich, C.W., 129n14
Möllendorf, P., von, 73n70
Morrison, A.P., 118n76
Muecke, F., 62n45
Muir, J.V., 147n51
Muller, L., 129n14
Muretus, M.A., 42n10, 83n15, 202n43
Murgatroyd, P., 216n62, 224n75
Musurillo, H., 185n9, 188n13, 189n16, 190n18
Mylonas, G.E., 69n60

Nagy, Gregory, 8n15, 15n29, 16n32, 21n39, 47n21, 57n39, 65n50, 97n40
Nancy, Jean-Luc, 14, 14n27
Nauta, R.R., 72n68
Newman, J.K., 35, 40n7, 49n25, 57n40, 69n58, 71n65, 129n14, 182n4, 190n17
Nisbet, R.G.M., 21n40, 22n43, 23n44, 25n51, 80n9, 111n64, 112n65, 112n66, 156n6, 270n58

O'Higgins, D.M., 57n40, 68n56, 69n58, 70n62, 71n64, 71n65, 76n76
Ogden, D., 47n21
Olender, M., 69n58
Olienis, F., 25n49, 36, 36n2, 158n13
Orelli, J.C., 57n40, 129n14, 172n37, 190n18, 193n23
Osgood, J., 80n9, 81n11, 98n43, 112n66

Palmer, A., 220n66
Parker, 8n15, 9n17, 15n28, 15n30, 30n62, 119n79
Pasoli, E., 188n13
Perret, J., 129n14
Plass, P., 218n64
Plüss, T., 36, 112n66, 160n18
Poe, Edgar Allen, 58n41
Pomeroy, A.J., 184n7, 186n10, 189n16
Porter, David, 20n36, 111n62, 121n1, 129n15, 170n34, 184n6, 188n13, 189n16, 229
Pòrtulas, J., 52, 72
Premerstein, A. von, 80n9
Putnam, Michael, 59, 170n34, 188n13, 195n28, 216n62, 222n71, 224n75, 226n78, 241n15, 272n63, 272n65

Quinn, K., 184n6, 214n58

Race, W.H., 80n10, 186n10
Rebuffat, R., 157n10
Reckford, K., 70n64, 188n13, 198n35
Redfield, J., 104n53
Reitzenstein, R., 136n29, 150n55
Richardson, L., Jr., 66n42, 69n58, 69n60, 69n61, 70n62–64, 71n65
Richlin, A., 121n1, 128n12, 129n14, 129n15, 131n18
Ritter, F., 222n70
Rose, G.P., 108n58

Rosen, R.M., 33, 36n3, 40n7, 52n28, 64n48, 65n50, 66n54, 72n67, 76n77, 116n72
Rösler, W., 73n70
Roth, Philip, 132
Rotstein, A., 36, 47n21, 52n28, 57n39, 57n40, 63n46, 64n48, 66n54, 69n58
Rowe, C.J., 218n64
Rudd, N., 62n45, 101n49, 112n65, 232n2, 245n23, 261n45, 264

Sampley, J.P., 53n32
Santirocco, M.S., 186n10, 188n13, 202n43, 222n71, 224n75, 226n78, 271n61
Schmid, U., 186n10
Schmidt, E.A., 36, 128n12, 138n32
Schneider, C.D., 118n76
Schönberger, O., 184n6, 186n10
Schoonhoven, H., 134n25
Schütz, H., 141n41, 244n20
Scodel, R., 42n9, 61n44
Screech, M.A., 53n32, 117n73
Scullion, S., 8n15, 69n60
Seaford, R., 8n15, 9n16, 15n28, 30n62, 61n43, 89n26, 106n56, 118n77
Searle, J.R., 215n57
Seel, O., 201n42
Segal, C., 199n36
Segal, E., 73n70
Seidel, M., 73n70
Sellar, A.Y., 112n66
Setaioli, A., 112n66, 158n11, 186n10
Shackleton Bailey, D.R., 83n15, 86n20, 107n57, 109n59, 133n23, 150n55, 165n28, 166n30, 174n44, 175n46, 209n52, 220n66, 238n9, 240n14, 242n17, 250n32
Shey, J.H., 185n9, 186n10, 189n16
Sider, D., 124n4, 131n17, 170n35
Slings, S.R., 47n21, 52n28, 97n40
Sluiter, I., 64n48
Smith, B., 214n57
Smith, David G., 124n6
Smith, R.A., 241n15
Smolenaars, J.L.L., 158n11, 159n15
Snell, B., 158n11
Steiner, D., 108n58
Storr, Anthony, 4n4, 9n17
Sturtevant, E.H., 103n51, 222n71, 226n78
Sussman, L.A., 54n35
Sutherland, E.H., 25n49, 184n6, 186n10
Syndikus, H.P., 184n6, 193n23, 202n43, 212n55, 216n62, 216n78, 271n61

Tandoi, V., 50n27
Tarditi, G., 44n15
Taylor, G., 118n76
Thom, S., 91n29, 112n66
Thomas, R., 271n61
Thomson, D.F.S., 48, 125n7, 192n21, 200n39
Thummer, E., 155n4
Tolkein, J.R.R., 111n63, 202n43
Traill, D.A., 202n43
Truman, Harry S., 25n51
Tsouna, V., 237n7
Turner, Victor, 9n16

Versnel, H.S., 128n12, 129n14
Vretska, K., 184n6, 186n10, 188n13

Wagenvoort, H., 111n64, 112n66
Waterfield, R., 218n64
Watson, L.C., 20, 20n36, 21n38, 21n39, 36, 40n7, 81n11, 87n23, 89n25, 89n27, 98n43, 99n45, 100n48, 101n49, 105n55, 108n58, 112n66, 126n9, 128n12, 129n14, 129n15, 131n19, 134n25, 136n9, 137n30, 138n32, 140n40, 148n52, 149n53, 150n54, 150n55, 153n1, 154n2, 156n6, 157n10, 158n12, 159n17, 160n18, 161n21, 162n22, 166n30, 172n37, 172n39, 173n40, 173n43

West, M.L., 47n21, 57n39, 64n70, 97n40, 124n5, 136n29, 184n6, 186n10, 193n23, 212n55, 214n58, 224n75, 271n62
Wickham, E.C., 22, 57n40, 75n75, 99n47, 180n10, 193n23, 212n55, 214n58, 216n62, 226n78, 238n9, 240n14, 242, 270n58
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von, 150n55, 189n16
Wilkinson, L., 122n3, 134n25, 150n55, 184n6, 193n23
Williams, B. (1993), 118
Williams, G., 135, 184n6, 193n23, 216n62, 224n75, 268n55
Wimmel, W., 159n17, 160n18
Winkler, J.J., 73n70
Wistrand, E.K.H., 134n25
Woodbury, L., 170n35, 171n36
Woodman, A.J., 204n46
Worman, N., 16n31, 26n52, 36n3, 55n37, 76n76, 104n53
Wray, David, 49n25, 54n34, 73n70

Zeitlin, F.I., 73n70